

P
UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

MAR 11 1959

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

modern language notes

VOL. LXXIV, NO. 2, FEBRUARY 1959

-
- 97 Calvin, Spenser, and the Major Sacraments. WILLIAM H. MARSHALL
101 Jonson on the Christ's College Dons. JACKSON I. COPE
103 The Fortunate Fall in *Paradise Lost*. WILLIAM G. MADSEN
106 Perth: An Organic Digression in *Moby-Dick*. JOHN SATTERFIELD
108 Animal Imagery in *The Red Badge of Courage*.
MORDECAI and ERIN MARCUS
111 A Symphasis of Antipaties in *The Dead*. PHILLIP DAMON
114 Dostoevsky and *Sanctuary*. EDWARD WASIOLEK
117 Dylan Thomas' First Published Poem. RALPH N. MAUD
118 A Poetic Envoi Considered as Art. LAWRENCE E. HARVEY
123 *Le Petit-Maistre de campagne* Again. SPIRE PITOU
127 A New Spanish Etymological Dictionary (Cont'd). LEO SPITZER
149 Ein paar Kleinigkeiten zu den Gedichten des Heinrich "von
Melk." ERNST A. EBBINGHAUS
151 "Tougen Minne" in the *Genesis*? KENNETH J. NORTHCOTT
153 Submerged Heroism—Elisabeth Langgässer's Story: *Untergetaucht*
HARRY STEINHAEUER

REVIEWS

- 159 GERARD MURPHY, ed. and trans., *Early Irish Lyrics: Eighth to Twelfth Century* (CHARLES W. DUNN)
- 162 W. TODD FURNISS, WILLIAM G. MADSEN and RICHARD B. YOUNG, *Three Studies in the Renaissance: Sidney, Jonson, Milton* (IRVING RIBNER)
- 164 WOLFGANG CLEMEN, *Kommentar zu Shakespeares Richard III: Interpretation eines Dramas* (HARRY LEVIN)
- 166 DALE UNDERWOOD, *Etherege and the Seventeenth-Century Comedy of Manners*; KASPAR SPINNER, *George Farquhar als Dramatiker* (LEO HUGHES)
- 169 EDWARD A. BLOOM, *Samuel Johnson in Grub Street* (D. J. GREENE)
- 173 PAUL LANDIS and RONALD E. FREEMAN, eds., *Letters of the Brownings to George Barrett* (K. L. KNICKERBOCKER)
- 175 WILLIAM FAULKNER, *New Orleans Sketches*, intro. by CARVEL COLLINS (JOSEPH V. RIDGELY)
- 176 CLIFTON CHERPACK, *The Call of Blood in French Classical Tragedy* (C. D. BRENNER)
- 177 P. J. NORRISH, *Drama of the Group. A Study of Unanimism in the Plays of Jules Romains* (WOLFGANG E. THORMANN)
- 180 DIANA RAMÍREZ DE ARELLANO, *Caminos de la creación poética en Pedro Salinas* (HORST BAADER)
- 182 MARÍA SOLEDAD CARRASCO URGOITI, *El Moro de Granada en la literatura (del siglo XV al XX)* (NICHOLSON B. ADAMS)
- 185 FRITZ MEYEN, *Johann Joachim Eschenburg 1743-1820* (MORGAN H. PRITCHETT)
- 187 C. F. W. BEHL and FELIX A. VOIGT, *Chronik von Gerhart Hauptmanns Leben und Schaffen* (HERMANN WEIGAND)
- 189 GEORG BRANDES, *Correspondance, Vol. II: L'Angleterre et la Russie; Vol. IV, 2: Notes et Références* (CAROL K. BANG)

modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,
General Editor

WOLFGANG E. THORMANN,
Managing Assistant

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
STEFAN EINARSSON
RENÉ N. GIRARD
RICHARD H. GREEN
THOMAS R. HART, JR.
ANNA G. HATCHER
HAROLD JANTZ
WILLIAM H. McCLAIN
J. HILLIS MILLER
LAWRENCE J. ROSS
CHARLES S. SINGLETON
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md. Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress, 16 July 1894.

in the

eines

KASPAR

Barrett

(ER)

Jules

lo XV

a und

Notes

through

s; \$6.25

e, \$1.00

s should

18, Md

must be

e of for-

number.

uscriptu

es, The

Every

d return

tors are

re, Md.

rate of

ongress,

the
nes
AR
ett

les

KV

nd
res

ugh
5.25
.00
uld
Md.
be
for
ber.
ipu
The
ery
urn
are
d.
of
est,

modern language notes

VOL. LXXIV, NO. 2, FEBRUARY 1959

Calvin, Spenser, and the Major Sacraments

In the First Book of *The Faerie Queene*, after Prince Arthur, who has been taken by many to represent an instrument of divine intervention, has rescued Redcrosse from Orgoglio's dungeon, he gives Redcrosse a pledge of friendship in the form of a diamond box containing a pure liquid "Of wondrous worth, and vertue excellent, / That any wound could heale incontinent" (I, ix, 19). The meaning here is clearly sacramental. The "few drops of liquor pure" could be primarily Eucharistic, as Padelford¹ suggested, or the reference might be general, that is, concerned with Christ's gift to man in the form of the sacraments themselves. The "living well" in terms of which Fradubio and Fræliissa have been promised redemption (I, ii, 43) is quite clearly baptismal. "*The well of life*" with its restorative powers (I, xi, 30) and "*the tree of life*" with "trickling streame of Balme" (I, xi, 48) have long been recognized as sacramental images.² In the Fourth Book, as soon as Cambell and Triamond drink from the cup offered them by Cambina, they reconcile their

¹ "Spenser and the Theology of Calvin," *Modern Philology*, xii (1914), 1-18.

² See Thomas Keightley, "Allegory in 'The Faerie Queene,'" *Notes and Queries*, Ser. 4, vii (1871), 1-2; R. E. Neil Dodge, "The Well of Life and the Tree of Life," *Modern Philology*, vi (1908-9), 191-6.

differences and become friends (IV, iii, 48-9). Certainly in Spenser's use of these various symbols there is little that could be called subtle, and interpretation offers no difficulty. Other symbols, such as Una's veiled face, less clearly and definitely suggest sacramental value, but so far as the suggestion is present, the symbols share one quality: they represent elements in which grace is somehow objectively present and thereby clearly possess intrinsic efficacy. All this has been rather widely granted, but its necessary implications with respect to Spenser's position in relation to the Established Church and Calvinism have been largely overlooked.

Calvin's assumption of man's total and "hereditary pravity" after the Fall (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, II, i, 8) precludes the possibility for man to do other than evil without the reception of grace, which is given to some and denied to others by the unalterable divine will. Christ has come to man as the Mediator, bringing grace. His followers constitute "the visible church"—"there can be no saving knowledge of God without Christ" (*Institutes*, II, vi, 4)—some members of which are among the elect, "the invisible church" known only to God. It is they who possess faith, a gift from which all others are necessarily and irrevocably excluded. Only works which spring from faith, real rather than apparent, are good: all else must be evil. Similarly, without faith the sacraments can in no way be efficacious, so that only the elect, the unknowing possessors of faith, can truly partake of the sacraments although they, paradoxically, do not need them, for their salvation has been ordained. The blood of Christ, "our true and only ablution," is "emblematically represented by water" in Baptism (*Institutes*, IV, xv, 2). Those who have truly received Baptism cannot sin, for they are among the elect; others, who really sin following Baptism, merely "appeared to belong to Christ" (*Institutes*, III, xxiv, 7). The Eucharist only emblematically represents the body and blood of Christ, which cannot actually be present because they are the human aspects of Christ, which are not ubiquitous. Neither of the major sacraments can restore, for one is already restored—that is, he has divinely given faith, to which the sacraments serve merely as seals—or one is damned.

The Anglican position is described with greater difficulty, for it involves what was both written and implied in the Articles. The sacraments are "not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather . . . certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace," by which God "doth not only quicken, but also strengthen

and confirm our Faith in him" (Article XXV). Baptism is "a sign of Regeneration or New-Birth," by which worthy recipients "are grafted into the Church" (Article XXVII). The Eucharist is the receiving of the body and blood of Christ "after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith" (Article XXVIII). Although some suggestion of the merely symbolic or emblematic value of the major sacraments is apparent, this does not exclude that viewpoint which has been traditionally accepted, that the sacraments themselves have an *intrinsic efficacy*. This is an essential and culminating point of distinction between the position of the Anglicans and the system of Calvin, for in accepting the proposition of intrinsic sacramental efficacy one necessarily rejects the doctrines of absolute election and reprobation: although we are dependent on divine grace, the Tenth Article asserts, it is specifically "the grace of God by Christ" which prepares us for the acceptance of good will and continues "working with us, even when we have that good will." The key lies in the use of the word *with* rather than the word *in* which had appeared prior to 1563.

It seems clear that if Spenser employed sacramental symbols, no matter how few, in which the essential quality is intrinsic efficacy—and this either is or is not the case, for the value itself is an absolute—then he was not merely revealing an exception to an otherwise consistent acceptance of Calvinism, but rejecting the very heart of Calvin's organic theological system.

The implications with respect to other doctrinal aspects of *The Faerie Queene* are rather obvious. If the sacramental symbols have the value which has been suggested, then it is meaningless for Redcrosse to be from the first part of Calvin's "invisible church," for his life to be a series of signs and events through which he tries to determine if he is really among the elect. Instead, the life of Redcrosse should be taken as that of every Christian, whose salvation or reprobation is never final until the end, who is capable of falling from grace to sin—real sin—and of returning at some later time to grace. Redcrosse's fall then becomes apparent in the series of conflicts which he has after his desertion of Una and before Arthur's intervention: he kills Sansfoy but is thereby ensnared by Duessa, he neither kills nor is conquered by Sansjoy, and he is defeated and imprisoned by Orgoglio. But even after his rescue Redcrosse falls again, for he yields to the argument of Despaire, a form of sin, and, conscious of

his own past guilt, he is about to destroy himself. His error appears to lie in his thinking in Calvinistic terms, for he looks upon his fall from grace as permanent, an indication that he has always been among the reprobate. Una stops him, asking, "In heavenly mercies hast thou not a part? / Why shouldst thou then despire, that chosen art?" (I, ix, 53) The suggestion would seem to be clearly Calvinistic, and much could be made of it. But in terms of the sacramental doctrine in *The Faerie Queene*, "chosen" should be taken to bring to mind the Anglican doctrine that all within the Church are elect, that is, they have been given the opportunity to save themselves if by the free exercise of will they decide to do so.

At this point Prince Arthur becomes significant. As a divine instrument for intervention, he is always seen to work *with* rather than *in* the human agent—giving the diamond box to Redcrosse but not forcing it upon him; destroying Maleger, a general evil, so that Guyon might be free to defeat Acrasia, a specific evil; offering protection to Florimell, who, taking Arthur for a force of evil, rejects him. Free will is presupposed, and we find rather direct suggestions of it at various points throughout *The Faerie Queene*. In the House of Holinesse, Fidelia tells Redcrosse "Of God, of grace, of justice, of free will" (I, x, 19).³ Britomart escapes Dolon "by God's grace, and her good heedinesse" (V, vi, 34). The Hermit, attempting to heal Serena and Timias—both wounded by the Blatant Beast and suffering from the effects of slander—counsels,

For in your selfe your onely helpe doth lie,
To heale your selves, and must proceed alone
From your owne will, to cure your maladie
(vi, vi, 7).

It becomes quite apparent that much of Spenser's terminology used with reference to such matters as election, sin, grace, and faith admits of ambiguities, and for this reason a more objective standard of judgment is desirable. I think that this is found in Spenser's sacramental symbols, with their clear expression of the idea of intrinsic efficacy, from which one can proceed to other theological matters.

All this does not mean that Spenser was not influenced by Calvin and his followers, but it does place limits upon that influence. Spenser

³ Padelford (p. 14) commented that this was "the very core of Calvinistic doctrine," but actually we do not know *what* Fidelia told Redcrosse about these things.

was a Calvinist to the extent that the Established Church was Calvinistic, but in the essential points of difference between the Establishment and Calvinism, Spenser seems to have been more orthodox than has sometimes been supposed.

University of Pennsylvania

WILLIAM H. MARSHALL

Jonson on the Christ's College Dons

Captain Ironside may have had "a piece of *Oxford Science*" in his head, but the late Master Polish and the late Mistress Steele knew something of Cambridge affairs. And so did Ben Jonson. There is a brief fireworks display in *The Magnetick Lady* which has passed with the commentators for a bit of malapropistic fun in which the Puritan Mistress Polish jumbles the treasury of her ignorance. But it is an aside which young Milton would have delightedly caught as a pin-pointed joke for the initiate. For it is Jonson's not unfriendly recognition of Milton's own Christ's College, Cambridge, and its reputation as a center of important intellectual debate.

When Polish mentions her deceased friend Mistress Steele, she boasts:

She would dispute the Doctors of Divinity
at her owne table! And the Spittle Preachers!
And find out the Armenians. [Doctor] Rut. The Arminians?
Pol. I say the Armenians. Com[pass]. Nay I say so too!
Pol. So Mr. Polish called 'hem, the Armenians!
Com. And Medes, and Persians, did he not? Pol. Yes, he knew 'hem.
And so did Mistris Steele! She was his Pupill!
The Armenians, he would say, were worse then Papists!
And then the Persians, were our Puritanes,
Had the fine piercing wits! Com. And who, the Medes?
Pol. The midle men, the Luke-warne Protestants! ¹

What Milton would have heard was an allusion to the turbulent theological and ecclesiastical ferment at Christ's, a college which housed three rival parties throughout the twenties and early thirties.

¹ I, v, 10-20, in Ben Jonson ed. C. H. Herford and P. and E. Simpson (Oxford, 1925-52), VI, 521. The editors' commentary (x, 345) is an economical repetition of that found in the edition of *The Magnetick Lady* ed. Harvey W. Peck. Yale Studies in English, XLVII (New York, 1914), pp. 126-7.

There was the backbone of Puritan "precisianists" to remind one of the College's Elizabethan reputation, a group led by Milton's tutor William Chappell,² until he began to reveal the Arminianism for which he was already notable by 1632, the date of Jonson's play.³ The "Armenians" found worse than Papists by Mistress Steele were the High Church "Powritans" headed by William Power,⁴ the Senior Fellow suspected by his eminent colleague Joseph Mede of physical misdemeanors as well as of being a Jesuit.⁵ And finally there were the "Medes" or "Medians," whose tag provides the key that opens the door unmistakably upon Jonson's allusion. These were, as Master Polish recognised, "the middle men," liberal divines and scholars nurtured by Mede, who embraced within their ranks Henry More, and thus contributed an important strain to Cambridge Platonism.⁶

Such an unexpected allusion raises two questions: for whom was it written into the play, and where did Jonson become initiated into the religious politics of Christ's College, Cambridge? The source of his knowledge must almost certainly have been Nathaniel Tovey, a contemporary at Christ's of Mede, Milton, More and the others. Tovey, son of her father's old tutor, had been orphaned early and subsequently adopted by Jonson's admired patroness, Lucy, Countess of Bedford. He had been raised in the Bedford household and had been sent to Cambridge at the Countess' own behest, that "the excellent talent which she saw in him might not be wasted away in the idleness of a Court-life."⁷ He was also connected with the family of Elisabeth, Countess of Rutland, another of Jonson's patronesses who was upon most intimate terms with him; after both Jonson and the lady were dead, one of her family obtained for Tovey the living of Ayleston in Leicestershire.⁸ The Cambridge religious quarrels, then, must have been common gossip in those particular courtly circles in which Jonson had held the firmest footing. Under these circumstances, this academic allusion in a Blackfriars play which was perhaps repeated at Court⁹ would have given a pleasant shock of recognition to several important auditors and potential patrons of the aging playwright's last offering.

The Rice Institute

JACKSON I. COPE

² Geoffrey Bullough, "Introduction" to *The Philosophical Poems of Henry More* (Manchester, 1931), pp. xiii-xiv.

³ David Masson, *Life of John Milton in Connexion with the History of his Time* (London, 1859), I, 90-1.

⁴ Bullough, p. xiv.

⁵ Masson, I, 130-1.

⁶ Masson, I, 87-90, 128-31 *et passim*; Bullough, xiii-xviii.

⁷ Masson, I, 91.

⁸ Masson, I, 92.

⁹ Jonson, IX, 253.

The Fortunate Fall in *Paradise Lost*

Commenting on the close of *Paradise Lost*, Addison remarks that "our two first Parents are comforted by Dreams and Visions, and cheered with promises of Salvation, and, *in a manner*, raised to a greater Happiness than that which they had forfeited."¹ Addison's hesitancy, expressed in the italicized phrase, has been shared by most critics. Until quite recently no one, so far as I know, has ever explicitly denied that Adam's fall in *Paradise Lost* was fortunate in a manner.² On the other hand, no one has ever been quite sure in just what manner it was fortunate. Adam himself, it has often been noted, does not say he ought to rejoice, he says he isn't sure:

full of doubt I stand,
Whether I should repent me now of sin
By mee done and occasion'd, or rejoice
Much more, that much more good thereof shall spring,
To God more glory, more good will to Men
From God, and over wrath grace shall abound. (XII, 473-8)

Indeed, there is very little to rejoice at in Michael's previous account of human sinfulness. In effect, all that he has said is that a few men will regain the happiness that Adam lost, and that the far greater part of mankind will suffer eternal damnation in Hell. Adam's enthusiastic response to Michael's recital may perhaps be accounted for psychologically when measured against the depth of his despair in Book X,³ but this will hardly satisfy the reader who expects the poet to justify the ways of God to man. It does not seem that much more good has sprung from Adam's sin if all that God can succeed in doing is salvage one or two men in every age and restore them to the blissful seat that all men would have enjoyed had Adam remained obedient.

But the blind poet has been granted a vision denied even to Michael, a vision that is both more terrible than Adam's eternal life of misery on earth and more glorious than Michael's eternal life of happiness in the new Paradise. Adam's Fall opens up for man an entirely new dimension of experience: if it was possible for man before the Fall

¹ *Spectator*, No. 369. Italics mine.

² "There is nothing here [XII, 473-8] which states or implies that Man's lot is or will be better than if Adam and Eve had not fallen." H. V. S. Ogden, "The Crisis of *Paradise Lost* Reconsidered," *PQ* 36 (1957), 18. Professor Ogden's essay is in part a reply to Millicent Bell, "The Fallacy of the Fall in *Paradise Lost*," *PMLA* 68 (1953). Mrs. Bell asserts that the Fall was fortunate but that it wasn't really a Fall; Professor Ogden insists that there was a Fall but that it wasn't fortunate.

³ Ogden, pp. 17-18.

to participate with the angels, as Raphael thought,⁴ after the Fall he may participate with the Godhead itself. Speaking to the Son in Book III God says,

Thou therefore whom thou only canst redeem,
Thir Nature also to thy Nature join;
And be thyself Man among Men on Earth,
Made flesh, when time shall be, of Virgin seed,
By wondrous birth: Be thou in *Adam's* room
The Head of all mankind, though *Adam's* Son.
As in him perish all men, so in thee
As from a second root shall be restor'd,
As many as are restor'd, without thee none.
His crime makes guilty all his Sons, thy merit
Imputed shall absolve them who renounce
Thir own both righteous and unrighteous deeds,
And live in thee transplanted, and from thee
Receive new life.

(III, 281-94)

Nor shalt thou by descending to assume
Man's Nature, less'n or degrade thine own.

(III, 303-4)

because in thee
Love hath abounded more than Glory abounds,
Therefore thy Humiliation shall exalt
With thee thy Manhood also to this Throne;
Here shalt thou sit incarnate, here shalt Reign
Both God and Man, Son both of God and Man,
Anointed universal King; . . .

(III, 311-17)

In this vision of the Incarnation, Christ is not merely the moral exemplar that so many critics have seen in *Paradise Regained*. Nor is the Redemption merely the legal transaction that Michael describes in Book XII. In these lines God the Father enunciates the central Christian mystery: the Incarnation involves not the lowering of Christ's nature to the level of human nature, but the exaltation of human nature to mystical union with God.⁵ The imagery here is not the warrior-angel's imagery of the Captain and the broken ranks, so much deplored by Malcolm Ross;⁶ it is the imagery of the New

⁴ V, 493-503. Critics often forget that Raphael is speaking of the possible destiny of unfallen man. This "Neoplatonic" vision of the etherealisation of matter has no relevance to the human situation as the Christian Milton sees it. It is, one might say, the highest insight available to pagan philosophers, who were ignorant of "how man fell / Degraded by himself," (*PR*, IV, 311-12), as Adam's fallen vision of utter futility and despair in Book X is the lowest.

⁵ The doctrine is also stated by Christ in XI, 38-44, and unwittingly by Adam in VIII, 427-31. The obverse of the doctrine is stated by Satan in IX, 163-71.

⁶ *Poetry and Dogma* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1954), p. 190.

Testament. Christ is the Head of mankind in Adam's room; He is the second root; He is the new Garden in which man will live transplanted. This last image is repeated in Book XI, where Christ tells God that fallen and regenerate man will produce

Fruits of more pleasing savour from thy seed
Sown with contrition in his heart, than those
Which his own hand manuring all the Trees
Of Paradise could have produc't, ere fall'n
From innocence.

(XI, 26-30)

The contrast here is not between the easily-won (and hence less valuable) moral fruits of unfallen man and the bitter-sweet fruits of moral struggle; it is between the purely natural, purely human fruits produced by man's "own hand" and the supernatural fruits produced by man's transplanting in Christ. The moral Paradise within that Michael speaks of is not the end-result of man's Redemption; it is only the beginning of a spiritual re-creation that will be consummated when man is united with Christ in Heaven. God, then, has not merely salvaged something from the destruction caused by Satan; He has created a new and higher order of existence. It is no longer a question of being "Improv'd by tract of time," as Raphael thought, or of a purely earthly existence ending in dust, as Adam thought, or of regaining the blissful seat of Paradise, as Michael thought. Nature's law has been superseded by a higher law, and man's destiny is to be united with Christ.

Or with Satan. For Milton did not flinch from the terrible vision of Hell. He knew that man's greatness lies in his capacity for damnation, and that a universe without Hell is a universe fashioned by hollow men. Paradoxically, the Fall was fortunate because Hell is a possible destiny. In Milton's universe, a universe that is something more than a moral gymnasium for the strengthening of character, if it were not possible for man in his pride to make the "foul descent" (IX, 163) with Satan, it would not be possible for man in his humiliation to be exalted in Christ to the Throne of God.

Wayne State University

WILLIAM G. MADSEN

Perth: An Organic Digression in *Moby-Dick*

Arms' suggestion that Melville's Perth may satirize Longfellow's "The Village Blacksmith" seems to be the only published interpretation of this character from *Moby-Dick*.¹ Yet it is disturbing to leave the matter at rest with this suggestion, for the chapter entitled "The Blacksmith"² prepares for that called "The Forge,"³ from all viewpoints one of the book's most important, that wherein Ahab is armed and commits the blasphemous baptism of his weapon. The juxtaposition of fairly irrelevant satire and climactic turning point appears to be unfortunate.

In a perceptive analogy, Lewis has compared the making of the armor for Achilles in the *Iliad*, xviii, to the forging of Ahab's harpoon.⁴ If the latter is Homeric in inspiration, a smith of epic origin would be infinitely more fitting as its maker than one parodying Longfellow's. Although Perth may have been the concrete, if fictional, counterpart of the *Acushnet*'s real smith,⁵ and although Melville may have used him incidentally to blow condescending sparks toward Longfellow, at the most meaningful symbolic level he seems to have been Melville's re-creation of Hephaestus. This reading is founded most importantly on the facts of Perth's lameness and his job. As Graves has said, "That the Smith-god hobbles is a tradition found in regions as far apart as West Africa and Scandinavia. . . ."⁶ In Homer, Hephaestus as smith is most prominent in the *Iliad*, xviii. Like Perth, he was described in business at his forge. Hephaestus explains his lameness briefly, but there was no necessity for him to relate his whole personal history: the Greek audience presumably already knew it.

Melville's smith does need an explanation for his lameness. With no contemporary mythological background, he is concretized in nineteenth-century terms by a submerged allusion to Greek mythology implied by the narration of his unsuccessful struggle with the "Bottle Conjuror" and the resulting family disaster. The story is hardly imaginative; it is the stock material of pamphlets produced by

¹ George Arms, "'Moby-Dick' and 'The Village Blacksmith,'" *Notes and Queries*, CXCI (May 3, 1947), 187-188.

² *Moby-Dick*, cxii.

³ *Ibid.*, cxiii.

⁴ R. W. B. Lewis, "Melville on Homer," *American Literature*, XXII (May, 1950), 171. The article quotes a letter from M. M. Sealts documenting Melville's familiarity with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* at the time *Moby-Dick* was composed. *Ibid.*, p. 168, n. 4.

⁵ Charles R. Anderson, *Melville in the South Seas* (New York, 1939), p. 34.

⁶ Robert Graves, *The Greek Myths* (Baltimore, 1955), I, 88.

temperance unions. But it serves its purpose extremely well, and it is amusing to speculate that even in his play *Perth* dealt with fire in its liquid form.

Basis for this speculation has been obligingly furnished by the myths involving Hephaestus. In the *Iliad*, i, Homer had him act as cupbearer to the gods, a role which may have suggested *Perth's* fault to Melville. And other mythology told that Dionysus, whom Hephaestus trusted, had gotten him drunk to persuade him to release Hera from a snare,⁷ a tale Melville could have run into easily. This alcoholic connection between *Perth* and Hephaestus does not seem to stretch probability.

Less significant, perhaps, is the fact that both smiths were bearded, for beards were prevalent among gods and Melville's sailors.⁸ That *Perth* had three children as had Hephaestus and Aphrodite may well be coincidence. And it is also possibly coincidental that Ahab calls *Perth* Prometheus in Chapter cviii and that Prometheus and Hephaestus are somewhat confused in Greek mythology.⁹ Such things with their implications aside, it does look as if a crippled smith-god and sometime victim of alcohol has been employed in the preparation of a harpoon of unusual, near-magic powers to serve Melville's hero as he meets his foe. The structure of the sequence of events appears to be perfectly analogous to that of the *Iliad*.

If this reasoning has any basis in fact, the frequently made charge of disorganized, digressive construction in *Moby-Dick* should be mitigated, at least in this instance. Further, the conclusion reached here tends to support the categorization of the book's form as epic, most cogently stated by Arvin,¹⁰ and to weaken the arguments for reading it as tragedy.¹¹

Davidson College

JOHN SATTERFIELD

⁷ George Howe and G. A. Harter, *A Handbook of Classical Mythology* (New York, 1947), p. 120.

⁸ *Moby-Dick*, xvi.

⁹ Graves, *op. cit.*, I, 149.

¹⁰ Newton Arvin, *Herman Melville* (New York: Compass Books, 1937), pp. 151 ff.

¹¹ F. O. Matthiessen, *American Renaissance* (New York, 1941), p. 415. See also Charles Olson, *Call Me Ishmael* (New York: Evergreen, c. 1947), pp. 66 ff.

Animal Imagery in *The Red Badge of Courage*

There is extensive use of animal imagery in Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage*.¹ This imagery largely takes the form of similes and metaphors. Excluding all of the numerous sunken metaphors which imply animal-like action, this short novel contains at least eighty figures of speech employing animals or their characteristics. These images occur in the narrative itself, in the dialogue, and in the thoughts of the central character. However unaware Crane may have been of the abundance and patterning of this imagery, the consistency with which it is used often furthers his characterization and presentation of ideas, and constitutes a significant method of communicating meaning.

The imagery employs domestic, wild, and imaginary animals, and also makes reference to undefined animal-like characteristics. References to domestic animals occur most frequently. With very few exceptions they are applied to people rather than to things, and they always refer to the enlisted men rather than to the officers. Wild animals, on the other hand, are used to describe things as well as individuals. Imaginary animals and vague animal comparisons tend to be used to describe groups of men.

The Red Badge of Courage is the story of Henry Fleming's initiation into manhood through a resolution of fear, and it is also a bitterly anti-romantic treatment of war—one which shows elements of naturalistic philosophy. Crane's use of animal imagery lends considerable support to the novel's themes and viewpoint. It is frequently used to describe the youth's feelings and actions as he passes through progressive stages of apprehension, terror, conquest of fear, and acceptance of the human situation. During the first thirteen chapters the animal imagery helps to portray his apprehensions about the enemy and his early behavior in battle. During this part of the novel the youth struggles with shame and terror. Feeling that he is inadequate to cope with the coming battle, he reflects that he and his comrades are all sure to be "killed like pigs." His shame about these feelings will not allow him to "warn" his comrades because he fears that a wrong declaration would "turn him into a worm." The youth's terror determines his perception of certain things. On the march at night he perceives the enemy campfires as "the red eyes . . . of a

¹ The only other mention of this point is a brief notation by Professor William M. Gibson in his introduction to Stephen Crane, *The Red Badge of Courage and Selected Prose and Poetry* (New York, 1956), viii.

row of dragons," and with at least a suggestion that the point of view is Henry's, his own regiment and army are several times described as a row of monsters, dragons, and wild horses, and he and his comrades are identified with familiar animals such as terriers and chickens. In the thick of battle Henry becomes a "well-meaning cow," and there is in his eyes the look that can be seen in those of a "jaded horse."

The culmination of his terror comes when he observes a fellow soldier throw down his gun and run "like a rabbit," whereupon Henry's fear makes him like "the proverbial chicken" which runs wildly about in all directions in its efforts to escape from danger. Later in the story of his flight, after many harrowing experiences, Henry pauses to consider his situation, and he realizes that he has acted like a worm and "a craven loon." Nevertheless, he cannot leave the scene of battle because of a "certain mothlike quality" within him. His terror, and the animal imagery which accompanies it, contrast sharply with his romantic feelings about war shown in the opening of the novel, when he saw himself full of "eagle-eyed prowess."

After the youth has begun to overcome his fear of battle, his attitudes about himself and about war alter, and the animal imagery which describes him also changes. After he and his regiment have participated successfully in a battle, they are described by the lieutenant as having fought like "hell-roosters" and "wild cats." Henry plunges at the enemy flag like a "mad horse." He now sees his comrades in a different light. He notices their "vicious wolf-like temper." Wilson, his friend, springs "as a panther at prey." The novel consists of twenty-four chapters: in the first twenty-three Henry has changed from a worm and a chicken to a wild cat; in chapter twenty-four he realizes that he has been an animal all the time that he was fighting, and his new acceptance of his precarious lot as a man is shown by his realization that he is a man and not an animal. "He was a man. . . . He had been an animal blistered and sweating in the heat and pain of war."

Crane's conclusion does not clearly suggest that the youth comes to understand that fear made him act like a terrified animal and newfound pride and courage subsequently helped him to act like a fierce animal. Nevertheless, Crane's attitude toward war, as we see it throughout the novel, suggests that he is critical of both fear and aggression. This critical attitude, and Crane's criticism of war, are partially communicated by animal imagery. As we have noted, much

of this imagery appears in the representation of Henry's feelings. Armies are often seen as monsters and serpents, and men at war are shown as the victims of strange and vicious forces which either make them timid and cowardly, or brave and reckless. In addition to these images, war is twice described as "the red animal—war." Although Crane's ironic treatment of Henry's cowardice suggests more approval for Henry's actions when he behaves with courage, Crane still communicates the idea that it is as bad to kill like a beast as it is to run like rabbit. Thus Crane's animal imagery contributes to his moral judgment of war.

The animal imagery also contributes to Crane's naturalism. This, however, is somewhat complicated by his attitude as shown in a scene rather early in the novel in which Henry seeks to justify his cowardice by comparing his behavior to that of a squirrel who runs when a pinecone is thrown at it. In the squirrel's flight Henry sees the law of Nature at work. Nevertheless, Crane's intention here seems to be at least partially satirical, which suggests that he is perhaps more critical of cowardice than he is of fierceness. In any case, Henry's assumption of manhood leads from an animal-like cowardice to an animal-like fierceness. Crane's inability to lead Henry to manhood by any means other than a release of contrasting animal-like forces in his soul may account for the charge of failure to convince which has often been made of Henry's assumption of manhood. Yet Crane's consistency may be defended by claiming that he has shown two similar but opposing forces which lead to the hero's realization that he is not an animal but a man. For Henry's manhood consists of a final courage which has stemmed from his earlier terror and wild courage. Nevertheless, Crane does not clearly show that his hero understands the ordeal he has experienced, and the fact that he has passed out of the realm where natural forces rule into a realm where will-power functions. Thus Crane is trapped in the dilemma of the determinist who wishes to assert the existence of will-power, but sees change only as the result of natural forces.

Crane's naturalistic tendency is perhaps most clearly visible in references to the soldiers as sheep. The men are driven about and "nobody knows what it's done for." The officers are like "critical shepherds struggling with their sheep." The "sheep" are controlled by forces they cannot understand, just as—in the determinist's viewpoint—man's life is shaped by forces beyond his comprehension or control.

In addition to conveying certain ideas about man and war, Crane's

animal imagery makes a considerable contribution to his impressionistic method of description. Many of the images we have cited add to the colorful and imaginative description which permeates the novel. Two particularly vivid and apt pieces of description employing animal images deserve special notice: "the bugles called to each other like brazen gamecocks," and "the blue smoke-swallowed line curled and writhed like a snake stepped upon."

We have cited only a rather small proportion of the numerous animal images in *The Red Badge of Courage*. More intensive examination of them would reveal additional vivid description, further support of leading ideas, and several ironic juxtapositions. Animal images and animal comparisons are used throughout the novel to convey changes in states of mind and the pattern of their development. Most important is Crane's use of them in presenting the theme of change from cowardice to wild courage, and finally from immaturity to manhood.

Purdue University

MORDECAI AND ERIN MARCUS

A Symphysis of Antipaties in *The Dead*

I do not expect much thanks for this effort to wring allegory from the satisfyingly naturalistic plot of Joyce's story *The Dead*. But since the allegory seems, for better or worse, to be there, it ought to be acknowledged—not, certainly, as a skeleton key to the story's meaning but as a mildly interesting circumstance in the genesis of our century's most extraordinary narrative technique.

One is alerted to arcane possibilities by Gabriel's obscure last word to the domestic dispute with Gretta about winter footwear:

"Goloshes!" said Mrs. Conroy. "That's the latest. Whenever it's wet underfoot I must put on my goloshes. Tonight even, he wanted me to put them on, but I wouldn't. The next thing he'll buy me will be a diving suit."

Gabriel laughed nervously and patted his tie reassuringly, while Aunt Kate nearly doubled herself, so thoroughly did she enjoy the joke. . . .

Gabriel knitted his brows and said, as if he were slightly angered:

"It's nothing very wonderful, but Gretta thinks it very funny because she says the word reminds her of Christy Minstrels."

Gretta's unlikely association of "goloshes" with the name of a Dublin music hall is, I take it, a case of symbolic distortion. Gabriel's

preoccupation with wet feet (We see him first as he is "scraping the snow from his goloshes . . . scraping his feet vigorously.") is an ironically precise and guilt-charged reminder of poor Michael Furey, the consumptive boy who, for love of her, had once stood too long in the rain and died of it:

" . . . so I ran downstairs as I was and slipped out the back into the garden and there was the poor fellow at the end of the garden shivering."

"And did you not tell him to go back?" asked Gabriel.

"I implored of him to go back at once and told him he would get his death in the rain. But he said he did not want to live."

The sight of Gabriel energetically insulating himself from the weather has been subconsciously agitating this memory, and with it her sense of guilt over Michael's death and the falseness of her marriage with a slightly obtuse valetudinarian. What Gabriel's goloshes really remind her of is Michael, and this painful fact has been kept latent by her distortion of Michael's name into the innocuous "Christy Minstrels." The process of association which has produced this distortion suggests Michael's symbolic dimensions. The word Minstrels has pretty obviously been suggested by the fact that Michael was a singer. ("He was going to study music only for his health. He had a very good voice, poor Michael Furey.") The word Christy, less obviously but more significantly, is derived from Gretta's unconscious association of Michael's sacrifice for her ("I think he died for me.") with Christ's passion, *passio Christi*. "Christus or Bloom his name is," says Stephen Daedalus of his much humiliated, symbolically immolated companion in *Ulysses*. Gretta's apparently irrelevant piece of word-association makes the same symbolic equation. And the equation is validated a little more explicitly at the end of the story when Gabriel, having come to personal and rather mystical terms with Michael's role in Gretta's life and in his own, sees, in his vision of Michael's grave, the symbols of Christ's sacrifice: cross, spear, and thorns:

It was falling, too, on every part of the lonely churchyard where Michael Furey lay buried. It lay thickly drifted on the crooked crosses and the headstones, on the spears of the little gate, on the barren thorns.

Another person with whom Gabriel comes into uncomfortable contact the night of the party is Freddy Malins. With his "coarse features, blunt nose, convex and receding brows, tumid and protruding lips," Freddy does well enough, even without any symbolic nuances, as a specimen of the uregenerate Old Adam. ("Now isn't he a terrible fellow!" says Aunt Kate sincerely and accurately.) But one

also notes that the catch in his voice which he has inherited from his mother is suspiciously like the slight stutter which, in *Finnegans Wake*, H. C. E. has passed on to his sons as the mark of the Nick in the Earwicker "nickrokosmikon." The heavy emphasis on Freddy's left-handedness (left fist, left eye, left hand recur insistently) recalls the metaphorically sinister significance of the continual references to left hand, left side, left leg in the Eumaeus episode of *Ulysses*. The possibility that we have in Freddy a Nick to Michael's Mick is supported by that heretical outsider at the party, Mr. Browne, who has apparently missed Freddy's name and calls him Teddy. The polyglot pun *theou dôron-malin* which lies in "Theodore" Malins is not very likely, at any stage of Joyce's career, to have been a coincidence. Mr. Browne has created the prototype of such verbal syntheses of "god-given" and "evil" as "Nick Dieudonnay" and "Gottgab and Baggut."¹

Mr. Browne is, as Aunt Kate² observes, a rather pervasive influence. ("Browne is everywhere," said Aunt Kate, lowering her voice . . . "He has been laid on here like the gas all during Christmas.") His gift for erasing distinctions and combining the incompatible appears several times during the evening. He wishes, for instance, that Protestants had monasteries like the Catholics do, and suggests that monastic asceticism would be all the better for the introduction of feather beds. He seems (as the reader has by now uneasily surmised) to be the original symbolic vehicle of the historical dialectic of Giordano Bruno of Nola—the predecessor of John Wyse Nolan, Browne and Nolan, B. Rohan and N. Ohlan, and all the rest of them. And his innocent mistake about Freddy's name is the humble beginning of the titanic series of struggles between Brunonian opposites "polarized for reunion by the symphysis of their antipaties."

I gladly forbear applying this particular "symphysis" to an inter-

¹ That Joyce was already formulating some of his portmanteau vocabulary is suggested by the passage in *The Sisters* where one sister speaks of the dead priest's unfulfilled ambition to visit his father's house "in one of them new-fangled carriages with the rheumatic wheels." Her confusion of a word for spirit with a word for one of the ills the flesh is heir to, symbolically summarizes the larger confusion of spiritual and material values which is the theme of the story. Compare "the pneuma with the rheuma" as a term in *Finnegans Wake* for the soul's post-lapsarian state.

² Does Aunt Kate, proud of a memory that stretches far back into the good old days, remind anyone else of Kate-Kathe-Kathleen in *Finnegans Wake*, "gathering relics of the great days into her nabsack"? Aunt Julia, who sings *Arrayed for the Bridal*, certainly suggests "my Aunt, Julia bride." That Gabriel should undergo his multiple humiliations in the house of two incipient symbols for Old Mother Ireland and the Irish Church has a certain abstract appropriateness.

pretation of the story. The verbal reconciliation of opposites does seem to parallel, though it can scarcely be said to reinforce, the processes of Gabriel's own final acceptance of Freddy, Michael, and the universe. But the parallel, if such it is, perhaps tells us more about how Joyce wrote his story than how we ought to read it. As Augustine said of Sacred Scripture, "hardly anything is expressed covertly which is not also said many times with the utmost clarity."

The Ohio State University

PHILLIP DAMON

Dostoevsky and *Sanctuary*

Even in the absence of precise information on Faulkner's reading habits,¹ it seems clear that in at least two important scenes in *Sanctuary* Faulkner has made use of two important images from the novels of Dostoevsky. The first, taken from *Crime and Punishment*, is the famous scene in which Svidrigaylov, on the eve of his suicide, sees the innocence of a young girl's face transformed suddenly into provocative shameless lust:

"But what was that? It seemed to him suddenly as though the little girl's long black eyelashes were quivering and fluttering, as though her eyelids were opening slowly, as though a pair of sly, sharp, little eyes were winking at him not at all in a childish way, and as though the little girl was pretending to be asleep. Yes, yes, that was so: her lips parted in a smile; the corners of her mouth twitched, as though she were trying to restrain herself. But in another moment she gave up all pretence. She was laughing! Yes, she was laughing! There was something shameless and provocative in that no longer childish face. It was lust, it was the face of a whore, the shameless face of a French whore. Now, without any further attempt at concealment, she opened both her eyes: they turned a blazing, shameless glance at him—they invited, they laughed. There was something infinitely horrible and outrageous in that laughter, in those eyes, in all that hideousness in the face of a child."²

The passage is to be compared with two from *Sanctuary* which

¹ William Faulkner, asked recently in a classroom conference at the University of Virginia to give his opinion of Dostoevsky, replied: "He is one who has not only influenced me a lot, but that I have got a great deal of pleasure out of reading, and I still read him again every year or so. As a craftsman, as well as his insight into people, his capacity for compassion, he was one of the ones that any writer wants to match if he can." "Faulkner in the University," ed. Frederick L. Gwynn and Joseph L. Blotner, *CE*, 19 (Oct. 1957), 6.

² *Crime and Punishment*, trans. D. Magarschak (Penguin, 1951), p. 521.

follow each other fairly closely. Horace Benbow is looking at a photograph of his step-daughter Little Belle:

"He moved, suddenly. As of its own accord the photograph had shifted, slipping a little from its precarious balancing against the book. The image blurred into the highlight, like something familiar seen beneath disturbed though clear water; he looked at the familiar image with a kind of quiet horror and despair, at a face suddenly older in sin than he would ever be, a face more blurred than sweet, at eyes more secret than soft."³

Horace's trip to Oxford in search of Temple, his meeting with Clarence Snopes and his visit to Miss Reba's house to see Temple and hear her version of the incident at the old Frenchman's Place come between the passage above and the one that follows:

"Enclosed by the narrow imprint of the missing frame Little Belle's face dreamed with that quality of sweet chiaroscuro. Communicated to the cardboard by some quality of the light or perhaps by some infinitesimal movement of his hands, his own breathing, the face appeared to breathe in his palms in a shallow bath of highlight, beneath the slow, smokelike tongues of invisible honeysuckle. Almost palpable enough to be seen, the scent filled the room and the small face seemed to swoon in a voluptuous languour, blurring still more, fading, leaving upon his eye a soft and fading aftermath of invitation and voluptuous promise and secret affirmation like a scent itself."⁴

In both the scenes of Dostoevsky and Faulkner, there is the horror of the spectator before the transformation of seeming innocence into shameless lust, the promise of depravity, the invitation to participation, and the play of illusion and reality, caught by Dostoevsky by the device of a dream, by Faulkner by the effect of slight movement and the play of light upon the picture.

For both Horace and Svidrigaylov the picture of innocence transformed into sin is a moment of climactic recognition. For Svidrigaylov it is one of self recognition: the lust he sees in the little girl's eyes is his lust, as the hotel with its cold veal, mice, small room, Charon-like waiter is a foretaste of the hell he had accurately divined for himself. For Horace Benbow the recognition is of a world mired in sex, of a ball cooling in space enwreathed by the smoking tongues of honeysuckle, Faulkner's consistent symbol for sex.

The second use of Dostoevsky in *Sanctuary* is of an anecdote that Ivan tells Alyosha in *The Brothers Karamazov* in their famous tavern meeting, of the poor illegitimate child abandoned to Swiss peasants and to hunger, misery and, with manhood, to crime. Condemned to

³ *Sanctuary* (New York, 1931), p. 200.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 267-268.

die for a murder society had prepared him to commit, he finds himself suddenly the center of human concern, hitherto denied him:

And in prison he was immediately surrounded by pastors, members of Christian brotherhoods, philanthropic ladies and the like. They taught him to read and write in prison and expounded the Gospel to him. They exhorted him, worked upon him, drummed at him incessantly, till at last he solemnly confessed his crime. He was converted. He wrote to the court himself that he was a monster, but that in the end God had vouchsafed him light and shown grace." *

Faulkner's use is in the form of an irritated outburst by Horace Benbow to Miss Jenny shortly after the incarceration of Lee Goodwin. A Baptist minister had taken Lee for a text as a murderer, adulterer, and polluter of the free Democratic-Protestant atmosphere of Yoknapatawpha county, and from him Horace gathered that "his idea was that Goodwin and the woman should both be burned as a sole example to that child; the child to be reared and taught the English language for the sole end of being taught that it was begot in sin by two people who suffered by fire for having begot it." *

In both a child abandoned by society to horrible conditions is claimed by the church and the civilizing forces of humanity not for sympathy but for judgment, not for true brotherhood but for the sole purpose of impressing him with his unworthiness to be part of it: Dostoevsky's Richard, who as a child envied the mash eaten by pigs, is taught to read so as to understand the justice of having his head chopped off; Faulkner's baby, brought up in "drugged immobility" and in a cardboard box to keep off the rats, is to be taught the English language so as to understand that "it was begot in sin by two people who suffered by fire for having begot it." For Dostoevsky the anecdote is one item of Ivan's revolt against the price of the ticket of God's world; for Faulkner it is one of a series of details arraignment the "decent" people and church of Yoknapatawpha county. It is a society that turns the condemned man's wife and child out of a hotel, and burns an innocent man to death for the protection of honor. It is a society whose protectors of honor would gladly violate its symbol, the shameless Temple Drake, and whose spiritual heart is Miss Reba's Memphis "ho'-house."

The use of two passages from Dostoevsky's novels does not suggest a pervasive influence of the great Russian upon *Sanctuary*, although

* *The Brothers Karamazov*, trans. C. Garnett (Mod. Lib.), pp. 284-285.

* *Sanctuary*, p. 151.

Faulkner's novel, in the violence in which it objectifies its moral problem, has the air of a Dostoevskian novel.

University of Chicago

EDWARD WASIOLEK

Dylan Thomas' First Published Poem

It has apparently not been noticed that "And death shall have no dominion," one of Dylan Thomas' most well-known poems (one of the two poems rendered by Emlyn Williams on the stage recently), exists in an early published form in *The New English Weekly*, Vol. III, No. 5 (May 18, 1933), p. 118, entitled "Death Shall Have. . .".¹ Since Thomas' poetry first came into prominence in the 'Poets' Corner' of the *Sunday Referee*, beginning with poems on September 3, 1933 and October 29, 1933,² and the only other poem discovered for that year is in the September issue of *Adelphi*,³ "And death shall have no dominion" is thus, by several months, the young poet's first publication outside Swansea.

The difference between the early and final versions of the poem are not so great as the condensation from four stanzas (of ten lines each) to three stanzas (of nine lines each) might suggest. The biblical refrain begins and ends each stanza in both versions, and three corresponding stanzas are substantially the same. The fourth stanza, of which little was retained, is typical of some of the verse Thomas was writing in 1932-33, rather bald statements of theme:

Under the sea or snow at last
Man shall discover all he thought lost,
And hold his little soul within his fist;
Knowing that now he can never be dust,
He waits in the sun till the sun goes out;
Now he knows what he had but guessed
Of living and of dying and the rest. . .

The poem exists in manuscript in the Dylan Thomas Collection of the Lockwood Memorial Library of the University of Buffalo, poem

¹ J. Alexander Rolph, *Dylan Thomas: A Bibliography* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons; New York: New Directions, 1956), p. 19, gives its first appearance as in *Twenty-Five Poems* (1936).

² Runia Shiela Macleod, "The Dylan I Knew," *Adam*, No. 238 (1953), 17-18.

³ Rolph, pp. 2 and 70.

"Twenty Three" in the notebook begun on February 1, 1933. The first version was copied down in "April '33," the revision made (on verso pages) "Feb 1936": each differs in only a few minor details from its printed form. The genesis of the poem can be seen in poem "Twenty Two" preceding it, in its final crossed-out lines:

Man's wants remain unsatisfied till death.
Then, when his soul is naked, is he one
With the man in the wind, and the west moon,
With the harmonious thunder of the sun.

(April 2 '33)

Finally, one discovers in fainter hand above the opening line of "And death shall have no dominion" the note: "printed in N E W"—one of Thomas' rare bibliographical pointers.

Harvard University

RALPH N. MAUD

A Poetic Envoi Considered as Art

Ne reprenez, Dames, si j'ay aymé:
Si j'ay senti mille torches ardantes,
Mille travaux, mille douleurs mordantes:
Si en pleurant, j'ay mon tems consumé,
Las que mon nom n'en soit par vous blamé.
Si j'ay failli, les peines sont presentes,
N'aigrissez point leurs pointes violentes:
Mais estimez qu'Amour, à point nommé,
Sans votre ardeur d'un Vulcan excuser,
Sans la beauté d'Adonis acuser,
Pourra, s'il veut, plus vous rendre amoureuses:
En ayant moins que moy d'ocasion,
Et plus d'estrange et forte passion.
Et gardez vous d'estre plus malheureuses. (Sonnet XXIV)¹

It is a temptation to view the last sonnet in the series of twenty-four written by Louise Labé as a piece of rhetoric, a letter in verse directed to the ladies of Lyons. Such a perspective, given an historical direction, leads to a study of the biography of the author and her relationship with the ladies of sixteenth-century Lyons.² It is quite

¹ *Œuvres de Louise Labé*, ed. Charles Boy (Lemerre, 1887), I, 107.

² Dorothy O'Connor in her study, *Louise Labé: sa vie et son œuvre* (Paris: Les Presses Françaises, 1926), pp. 83-85, considers sonnet XXIV as evidence

possible, however, to treat the sonnet as poetry. From this point of view, the ladies are merely a pretext, a way of portraying or "imitating" the power of love and the suffering it causes.

Sonnet XXIV is constructed on an opposition between irrationalism and rationalism, love and nonlove. In past time two distinct experiences are represented: that of the passionate narrator, shown as a suffering victim of love, and that of the faultless but unloving ladies of Lyons. The former experience projects into present time as pity, the latter as blame. The second division of the sonnet, the last seven lines, creates a hypothetical future in which the coldly critical and severely rational ladies are made the easy victims of love. Line 14 suggests a reaction of pity for their suffering to come. The narrator may desire them to learn compassion but cannot bring herself to wish her misery on anyone, even the uncharitable ladies of Lyons. The happenings in the hypothetical future point backwards in time to the present, to which they bring a reaction of pity, not blame. The present, then, is dominated by pity from past and future, while blame appears as an aberration of inexperienced and overconfident reason. In other words, sonnet XXIV presents two reactions to a given situation, an inadequate one and an adequate one. The poem achieves its effect, pity for the sufferings of the narrator, partly by the contrast between the two reactions. The narrator deserves pity not only because she suffers from love but also because the ladies of Lyons persecute her unjustly. The invitation to pity is further strengthened by the model reaction (to a situation analogous to hers) suggested by the narrator.

The first seven-line division of the poem consists of three parts, each of which contrasts past love and suffering with present blame, discrediting the latter. This effective triple plea is supported by a significant pattern that violates in the most obvious way the traditional expectations. The seven-line division, in itself, is in sharp contrast to the usual octave. It is divided in detail as follows: 1-3-1-1-1. The first, fifth, and seventh lines represent the attacks of the puritanical ladies.³ The structure may suggest a kind of psychological encirclement, a constricting prison that encompasses the sufferer, whose pains are represented in the tercet (lines 2 through 4) and in line 6. It

in favor of her position that Louise Labé was a "courtisane honnête." "Pourquoi," she writes, "dans ses vers, s'est-elle si souvent excusée d'avoir aimé, s'il n'y a rien eu de coupable dans son amour? 'Ne reprenez, Dames, si j'ai aimé,' dit-elle dans ce vingt-quatrième sonnet, le dernier de son volume, qui est en quelque sorte un envoi poétique."

³ More strictly speaking this is true of only the first part of lines one and seven, since the last part of these lines refers to the narrator.

is not hard to imagine the social parallel in sixteenth-century Lyons. The verbs used in the framing lines are *reprendre*, *blamer*, and *aigrir*. One may find here a progression in intensity, since the etymology, *blasphémare*, no doubt more closely associated with *blamer* in the sixteenth century than today, would make it stronger than *reprendre*. *Aigrir*, by its sound and by its etymology, *acer* (pointed, penetrating) moves beyond the idea of verbal reprimand to suggest, metaphorically, concrete, physical attack. More important than such a progression, however, is the contrast between the strength of all three terms and the much greater force of the expressions referring to love's power. Even *aigrir* can only increase suffering that is already extreme. The contrast between the abilities of the ladies and of Love to inflict suffering is illustrated by the juxtaposition of *point* and *pointes*, the former seemingly truncated by comparison with the latter (which is supported by the repetition of the plosive and the semantic power in *violentes*). In general, *reprendre*, *blamer*, and *aigrir* (even taking into account their etymological meanings) must be considered relatively mild by comparison with the violence of the lines contained within the framework: *mille torches ardantes*, *mille travaux*, *mille douleurs mordantes*, *pleurant*, *consumé*, *peines* (Gr. *poinê*—punishment). It is as though the framework were inadequate to restrain such violence, as though it might break forth in an eruption of pain and turmoil. This impression is intensified by the unequal length of the clauses in lines 2 and 3, suggestive of the restless writhing of the victim, by the continuity of meaning that overflows the break between lines 2 and 3, and especially by the flaunting of the quatrain division. The sense of urgency achieved by the reduction in time between imperatives also contributes. Finally, the walls do fall, and suffering overflows into the last part of line 7.

In part I, the ladies attack the lover for having loved. This is very close to an attack on love itself. It is in this context that the above containment-eruption structure must be considered. The breaking of the framework, in other words, is a kind of anticipatory victory of love over the ladies. The definitive conquest in part II, therefore, comes as no surprise. The reversal (the attacker becomes the attacked) is made more vivid by the identical nature of the framework that contains it. Part II, like part I, is seven lines long and has a compartmented structure (1-2-1-2-1), which, in this case, is reinforced by the rhyme scheme in the sestet (cc d ee d), a French innovation in the Italian sonnet. Line 8, usually the culminating line in the octave, retains the superior position assigned to it by tradition, for, even though it acts

here as the first line in the second division, expectation remains in the reader's mind. One may even argue that, because of the unusual break after seven lines, this sense of expectancy is actually heightened. The importance of this keystone position is not wasted. The eruption out of part I comes to its fulfillment, in a sense, in the precise physical center of line 8 with the appearance, as of Mephistopheles from the flames, of the god, *Amour*. Everything in the sonnet leads up to this point. It should be the high point in pitch, the voice having risen gradually with the rising emotion and accelerating tempo. After this point, everything drops off. The pitch falls from one stage to the next, and the pace slows down until one approaches a kind of contemplative stasis in line 13. Line 14, set off in its ominous suggestiveness from the rest of the poem, should be read almost in a whisper.

The framing lines in part II—8, 11, 14—present *Amour* in all its power. The first of the two distichs contained within the framework heightens that power by rejecting two conceivable restrictions on it: the ladies do not have to be passionate types nor the men endowed with the beauty of an Adonis. The second distich echoes the first and links it to the past love of the narrator. At the same time, it reverses the order of the two restrictions and creates, thereby, a sense of completion that reinforces the break between lines 13 and 14 (already strongly indicated by the punctuation and the syntactical shift from third person description to imperative) and helps to give this final line the importance its meaning suggests it should have. *Amour* now occupies the active position held by the agents of "reason" in part I, while they become passive. The opposition, in the contrast between line 8 and the following distich, is at the extreme point. The repetition of *sans* stresses the fact that the combat is a fair one. *Amour* employs no fifth column to undermine the enemy's strength. At the same time, the reiteration of *sans* clearly suggests the essentially negative character of rationalism. If the opposition is extreme in the first distich, in the second it has been obliterated. The distance traversed in the transition, to use a spatial metaphor, is a measure of the decisiveness of love's victory. This total destruction of the tension between framework and content reverses the situation at the end of part I, where the tension had become so great that it resulted, figuratively, in an eruption.

Line 11, the center line of part II, marks the moment of Love's hypothetical triumph. The presence of a *si* at this pivotal point confirms the importance of the framework pattern and supports the idea of reversal. While the series of *si*'s in part I is contained within

the framework, the pivotal *si* in part II forms a part of the framework itself. However, an examination of the pattern of *si*'s illuminates the poem in another way. A cursory reading of the first part of the poem may very well lead one to ascribe the use of *si* to the narrator's reluctance to admit her guilt in a completely explicit way. Such a reading is based on the most usual sense of *si*, that of supposition or hypothesis: "Do not reprimand me, Ladies, if I have loved (but it is not certain that I have)." A closer study of the text, however, makes it evident that the primary meaning of *si* is not hypothetical but causal. The verb *reprendre* is used in an absolute sense (as in *il trouve à reprendre à tout*), and *si* is equivalent to *parce que* (as in *Si je ne vous ai pas averti, devez-vous m'en blâmer*). The meaning then is "Do not reprimand me, Ladies, because of the fact that I have loved, etc." In spite of the logical superiority of the latter reading, the idea of hypothesis persists in the reader's mind, perhaps partly because of the *si* in line 6, which, although it may be read as causal, seems less forced if interpreted as the hypothetical "if." The ambiguity is a real one, I believe, but one that signals richness rather than contradiction. The key to the understanding of the problematical sequence lies in the pivotal *si* of part II. Here the conjunction clearly denotes an hypothesis. At the same time, it is impossible not to relate this *si*, which expresses the omnipotence of *Amour*, to the conspicuous series in part I. The implication is obvious. In so far as *Amour*, and not the passive subject, is responsible for passion, the *si*'s of part I are hypothetical. The active agent in this meaning is not the *je* but *Amour* working in the *je*. In so far as the narrator can be considered a guilty agent (and the poem argues against this more external, superficial view), the *si*'s are causal. It is perhaps in the depth and truth of this poetic hesitation, expressed through the detail of linguistic ambivalence, that much of the value of the poem lies. To what extent is a human being free and responsible?⁴ The extreme answer of the ladies is balanced by the extreme answer of the narrator-lover, the *si* of causality by the *si* of supposition, and the truth, the poet seems to say, may lie somewhere in between.⁵

If the climax of the sonnet comes at the center of line 8, it is

⁴ Needless to say, the element of divine grace does not enter into consideration in this humanistic world.

⁵ Much closer, no doubt, to the narrator-lover's position than the ladies'. Nevertheless, the oversimplified solution that would completely justify the lover and make the poem more didactic than poetic is avoided. Some room for self-criticism is implicit in the acceptance of suffering, some degree of self-doubt in the series of *si*'s. The resultant complexity is a sign of artistic validity.

nonetheless true that line 14 constitutes a hardly less important aesthetic moment. At first glance, it may seem logically strange—and contradictory to the fact of the syntactical separation—that the conjunction beginning the line is not *mais* but *et*, yet the author's choice shows real poetic genius. *Mais* would complete the separation, making it logical as well as syntactical, and, by cutting the last line off from the rest of the poem, give it the status of an admonitory afterthought. *Et*, on the other hand, maintains the logical connection—for a very good reason—while utilizing the syntactical separation to create suspense. The repetition of the formal pattern of part I becomes progressively more evident as the reader proceeds through part II and leads him to expect a parallel development in meaning. All the signs point in this direction. After seven lines of reiterated love and suffering in the past come six lines of love alone in the hypothetical future (the conquest by *Amour* that must have preceded the suffering in part I). The lacuna creates a sense of foreboding expectation that is powerfully fulfilled in the menacing suggestion of line 14. All the explicit suffering of part I, and more, is implied in this last line, made even more effective by a shift to the negative that resembles a shudder of horror at the very thought of such suffering. The connective *Et* is like a bridge that spans the gap between lines 13 and 14 and allows the accumulated momentum to carry meaning and pattern to their logical consummation in line 14. Instead of a proclamation of suffering at the end, the author wisely limits herself to indirect suggestion (which accords with the vocal fade-out, the slowing down in tempo, and the resolution of tension), leaving to the imagination of the reader ("guided" by the information in part I) the ominous outline of inexpressible misery.

Dartmouth College

LAWRENCE E. HARVEY

Le Petit-Maître de campagne Again

In his chapter on ten lost plays acted at the *Comédie Française* between 1701 and 1715, the late Professor Lancaster notes that the earliest of these compositions, *Le Petit-Maître de campagne, ou le vicomte de Genicourt*, is listed in Soleinne, no. 1589, as "rare"¹

¹ Henry Carrington Lancaster, *Sunset; A History of Parisian Drama in the Last Years of Louis XIV, 1701-1715* (Baltimore, 1945), p. 299.

and explains that, being unable to examine the play, he was obliged to rely upon the analysis of the frères Parfaict for his information.² Now although the frères Parfaict were unaware of it, the play was published;³ it is available at the Arsenal library in Paris.⁴ So it would seem pertinent to offer a more detailed account of this work for, while it is but a one-act comedy and was put on the boards only three times, it does have the distinction of having served as a companion piece for *Venceslas* and *Phèdre*.⁵

The action of the twenty scenes in this one-act play in prose is evolved by seven characters all of whom have a more or less immediate connection with the central situation. Monsieur de S. Armel wishes to give his daughter, Mariamne, in marriage to the vicomte de Genicourt although she has hopes of becoming the wife of Eraste. The situation moves forward when the rumor is spread by means of an anonymous letter that M. Ricotte, to whom Monsieur de S. Armel owes a large sum of money, is coming to claim payment. The viscount immediately disclaims any intention of marrying Mariamne now that he is convinced that her family's fortune is on the verge of depletion. But the situation is saved when it is learned that M. Ricotte is none other than Eraste, Mariamne's beloved in the first place.⁶ However, while the plot and its resolution depend upon a revealed identity, and two of the characters (Eraste and the viscount) have been or are known by

² The analysis is given in their *Histoire du théâtre françois*, XIV, 220-5.

³ Paris: Jean Moreau, 1701. In-12°, 47 pp.

⁴ 8° B. 14.506.

⁵ It was played for the first time with *Venceslas* on July 26, 1701, then with *Phèdre* on July 28, 1701, and finally with La Chapelle's *Cléopâtre* on July 30, 1701. For statistics about finances and spectators for these performances, cf. H. Carrington Lancaster, *The Comédie Française, 1701-1704; Plays, Actors, Spectators, Finances*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, V, XLI, Part 4 (1951), p. 598.

⁶ The details scene by scene: Marton pleads with Mariamne, her mistress, not to accede to her father's wishes that she marry the vicomte de Genicourt (sc. 1). But Mariamne's father, M. de S. Armel, is obdurate; also, it is revealed that he owes the missing son of his former business partner 100,000 *écus* (sc. 2). Revealing himself to be a conceited fool (sc. 3), the viscount persists in his suit (sc. 4); Mariamne decides to speak to his mother (sc. 5) while Marton determines to enlist the aid of his disgusted valet, Bastien (sc. 6). The viscountess refuses to listen to Mariamne (sc. 7-8), but Marton plans a letter to the viscount revealing that the missing heir, Ricotte, is back to claim his 100,000 *écus* (sc. 9). But Eraste despairs of winning Mariamne's hand (sc. 10) when, with Mariamne and Marton concealing themselves (sc. 11), Bastien gives the spurious letter to the credulous viscount (sc. 12). Refusing to have anything to do with Martin (sc. 13) or Mariamne (sc. 14), the now recalcitrant viscount forwards the letter to his mother (sc. 15). Eraste challenges the viscount to a duel, but the nobleman explains that his affection for Mariamne has cooled in view of her father's debt of 100,000 *écus* (sc. 16). A complete reconciliation takes place with the revelation that Eraste is Ricotte (sc. 17-20).

two different names, the principal comic interest is in the vicomte de Genicourt and his mother rather than in the plot and the confusion that it fosters. In fact, the revelation at the end of the play that Eraste is Ricotte, and *vice versa*, has about as much importance as the revelation at the end of Molière's *L'Avare*.

The treatment of the two comic characters calls to mind, however, *Les Précieuses ridicules*. The earlier and better known comedy presents, as is known, "deux pecques provinciales" displaying a nearly spectacular and certainly misled elegance in manners and refinement of speech; *Le Petit-Maître de campagne* portrays in similar fashion a man and a mother, instead of two cousins, affecting what they believe in their provincial fashion to be "le dernier cri" in certain matters of manners and taste. Both couples believe themselves to be "furiously" genteel. It is true, of course, that the elder member of the family in Molière's play is a male character and a bulwark of common sense in his own domain whereas the elder character in *Le Petit-Maître de campagne* is a woman and as senseless as her junior counterpart, but this difference between the two plays is in the structure rather than in the tone or theme. For it is clear that both plays have this in common: they hold up to ridicule provincial snobs who assume manners that are alien to their being and quite incongruous with their station. If one is to seek the really essential difference between the treatment of comedy in the two compositions, one should point to the fact that Molière's production has the greater range in depth and breadth, furnishing as it does the more numerous and more penetrating insights into those two influential strata of seventeenth-century society, the bourgeoisie and the *précieux*.

The idiosyncrasies of the two members of the Genicourt family are indicated by the other characters in addition to their own parading of their peculiar quirks. The second scene, for example, finds the following adjectives applied to the son: "fat," "sot," "extravagant," "insolent," "glorieux," and "méprisant." In the sixth scene, uneducated Bastien adds that he is "un bijarre [sic], une cavalle [sic] à rebours." His future father-in-law admits him to be "un singe des Petits-Maîtres [de Paris]," this latter remark prompting Marton to exclaim (sc. 2): "Fi donc, leur singe! Voilà une plaisante figure pour vouloir les imiter. Il en a tout le ridicule sans en avoir l'esprit, il copie si mal leurs airs & leurs manières." The mother is not as thoroughly assailed by these or other characters, it having been thought enough apparently to liken her to her son.

But the direct presentation of the characters' foibles being a more effective device, this method is employed with greater frequency. When the viscount makes his first entrance, he is accompanied by a swarm of hunting dogs. For he is the man of the chase par excellence. When he rides to the hounds, he explains: "Je voudrais que vous me vissiez sauter un fossé; je m'en acquitte mieux que Romulus" (sc. 3). This is not his only virtue. Possessed of incredibly high intellectual ability, he admits that in college he spoke "latin comme un Demosthene." His formal training completed, he attained ultimate polish in the world of "les Jeux & les Caffés." Thus he can say with all conviction: "C'est mon fort que les reflexions. Rien n'échappe à ma penetration. J'ay trop d'esprit. J'ay ce défaut-là" (sc. 12). Also, needless to add, he is irresistible to women . . . "il n'y en a point qui ne se trouvent deshonorées de mes visites" (sc. 15).

Like her son, the viscountess reveals that she has always been attractive to the opposite sex: "J'ay toujours esté gaye, vive, spirituelle; je n'avois pas dix-huit ans que j'amusois déjà des hommes raisonnables." Even at her present age, her "veuvage est persecuté," especially by those two noblemen, the bankrupt baron and the penniless count. Even her male servants look upon her with longing eyes, and it is with good reason that she exclaims: "Je plais à tous les hommes. Que je fais naitre de passions! Si j'étois dans le goût de me remarier, vingt Gentilshommes pleins de merite meurent d'envie de m'epouser." Like her son, too, she has a special interest, music. Her favorite instrument is the "tambour de basque," an instrument which her footman used to play. For she does not love all music indiscriminately: "Quand j'étais à Paris, j'allois si souvent à l'Opera, que je m'y ennuyois. Tous ces instrumens ensemble font un bruit terrible. On n'entend ni ciel ni terre. . . . Outre cela, quand les acteurs chantent, vous entendez au bas du Theatre un mauvais bourdonnement de violons qui blessent les oreilles delicates" (sc. 7).

What the frères Parfaict and Professor Lancaster report about the play, therefore, is substantially correct as far as they go; it is a one-act play which involves "a financial transaction, and satirizes a young nobleman and his mother" (*loc. cit.*). But it is somewhat unfair to reject the play, because "the plot is simple and unconvincing." For

¹ Her ideas on love and marriage are worth recording too: "Car comme les gens qui s'aiment lors qu'ils se marient, se haïssent lors qu'ils sont mariez; de même ceux qui se haïssent en se mariant, s'aiment beaucoup quand ils sont mariez . . . Lorsque feu mon mari m'epousa per exemple, je le haïssois, je le haïssois, je ne pouvois le souffrir. Quand il mourut, je commençois à l'aimer (sc. 8).

if the plot is unconvincing, it is so for the simple reason that authors of comedy of manners or character in the age of Louis XIV did not concern themselves overmuch with plot. Of course, being in only one act, *Le Petit-Maître de campagne* did not have sufficient substance to endure beyond its time. But, within the limits of its scope, it doubtlessly brought laughter to the lips of at least some members of an audience that Molière had taught to expect so much.

Marquette University

SPIRE PITOU

A New Spanish Etymological Dictionary (Cont'd) *

BUFIÁN as a derivative by means of the suffix *-ianus* from *rufus* 'red-haired' seems to me not eliminated by the remark directed against Migliorini: "tal formación latina es inverosímil." Migliorini considered this coinage as a 'sham-proper name' ("nome proprio fittizio") formed after true Latin proper names with *-ianus*, just as he considered the Vg. Latin *ebriacus* formed after Latin (<Gaulish) proper names in *-iacus* (a suggestion not mentioned by C., s. v. *embriagar*). The pseudo-proper-name is a phenomenon to be found in all languages (cf. German *Grobian*[us] formed with the same *-ianus* suffix; It. *il signor Ubbriachini* quoted by Migliorini and many more such pseudo-names in my book *Die Umschreibungen des Begriffes 'Hunger'*): *il tenente Petiti* = 'apetito' etc.

SANSIROLÉ < *San Ciruela*. About such 'pseudo-saints' I should like to see quoted Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.* II, 221 ff.

SANTISCARIO 'caletre' in sentences such as *salirse algo a alguno de su santiscario*, *hacer galenterí as de su santiscario*. Since we have clearly to do with a semi-Latinism, I wonder whether our word is not that Latin word *escarium* 'purse for money' which Nebrija uses in his Latin translation of *yesquero*: "*esquero, de yesca: escarium*," obviously connected with Latin *escarius* 'pertaining to food' (*vasa escaria*, Pliny) which gave *esquero*, 'bag for the bait, purse,' C., s. v. *yesca*. Span. *isca* forms exist which C. traces back to Gr. *iská* in medical writers (<Lat. *esca*). The first member of the compound (or pseudo-prefix) *sant-* is to be explained in the same way as the Fr. phrases *tout le saint-frusquin* 'all one's worldly goods', formed from *frusques* after the pattern of *saint-crêpin*, 'shoemaker's tools' (*tout son saint-crêpin* 'all one's worldly goods'). The addition of *saint* is, as Bloch says, "un procédé populaire." In Sp. we may imagine phrases such as **sacar todo de su (sant') iscarío*, 'to draw everything from one's own mental reservoir.'

* Juan Corominas, *Diccionario crítico-etimológico de la lengua castellana*, vol. IV (Ri-Z; Indices). Bern: Francke, 1957. 1225 pp.

SARTENEJA. In the quotation from a speech of a shepherd in Diego Sánchez de Badajoz *pesia a sarteneja*, I ask myself whether we have not to do with a transmogrified form of *satan(ds)* + *-ejo* suffix of *diablejo*.

SEMASIOLOGÍA (s. v. SEMÁFORO) was not coined "algo antes [before *sémantique*, Bréal 1897] en Alemania o Inglaterra (1877)," but as early as 1839 by the German Karl Reisig (not A. Reisig, as B. Terracini writes in the Italian encyclopedia, s. v. *semántica*): a part of his *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft* is entitled "Semasiologie oder Bedeutungslehre."

SENTAR. Add to the Italian Castilianism *assentare* the particular semantic development of It. *assentarsi* 'arrolarsi' (and the derivative noun *assento*) which in turn is the source of the Austrian-German term *assentieren* 'to enlist (in the army),' all of them ultimately derived from Sp. *asentar* 'poner en servicio, tomar servicio' (Cuervo I, 632). Cf. my article in *GRM* x, 182.

SEÑOR. In regard to Sp. *so* (*so tunante*), Port. *seu* (*seu burro*) as ironical accompaniment of insults, cf. my *Aufsätze z. rom. Syntax u. Stilistik* (1918), p. 5 ff., where I offer objections against Tobler's identification of such expressions with the possessive pronoun of the 3rd person.

SERENO. One should like to see *sereno* 'night-watchman' mentioned and dated. SÍFILIS: for a more detailed bibliography and a new explanation see my article in *Bull. of the History of Medicine*, xxix (1955), 269 ff.

SINDÉRESIS "Sin duda debe de pertenecer a la terminología lógica del latín medieval aunque falta en Du C[ange]." Unfortunately, C. does not make it a practice to consult dictionaries of philosophy. Had he looked up Lalande he would have found that the word was used by St. Jerome in his commentary of Hezekiel as synonym of *scintilla conscientiae* ("qui n'a pas été perdue dans la chute originelle et grâce à laquelle, même quand nous nous abandonnons à la passion ou à l'appétit, nous pouvons savoir que nous faisons mal"), the very expression which is found in one of the Catalan texts quoted by C. ("la sindéresis, que vol dir la cintilla de aquella lum de intelligencia"), and that Thomas Aquinas quotes St. Basilus who said, "Conscientia sive Synderesis [variant *synteresis*] est lex intellectus nostri . . . in quantum est habitus continens praecepta legis naturalis, quae sunt prima principia operum humanorum." It would then appear to be a term more of moral philosophy than of logic.

SOBEJO, s. v. SOBRE. I do not quite see why the etymology **superculus*, buttressed as it is by It. *soverchio*, offers a matter of doubt: the loss of the *-r* is paralleled by the Sp. forms of *sarculum* -*are*: *sacho*, -*ar*; *sallar*, *sajar*, all three dialectal developments without *-r* according to C., s. v. *sacho*, and the V. Lat. formation **superculus* -*a*-um from the adverb *super* is not more remarkable than *minusculus* *maiusculus* (*plusculus* from the respective adverb). Neither do I understand why *sobrado* with *-d-* should be derived from *super-additum* (*dd'* + >*d'*); why not simply admit an etymon *superatum*?

SOCARREÑA 'the projecting rim of a roof, attic.' C. considers the *-eña* form as the original one and attempts a derivation from *suggrundia* > **suggurundia* (with anaptyctic vowel) > **socarueña* (with the double consonant *gg* > *c* as in Catalan *retre* < *reddere*, *gepa* < *gibbus* and with *-undia* > *-ueña* as in *verecundia*

>vergueña) >*socareña (like *curueña* > *cureña*) > *socarreña* (under the folk-etymological influence of *socarrar* 'to singe') > *socarrena* (with replacement of the suffix *-eña* by *-én* < *-agine*)—a very laborious construction indeed which mainly suffers from the assumption that double consonants in Sp. may evolve as in Catalan. But *addere* gives in Sp. *añ-adir*, *gibbus* gives *cheпа* only in Aragonese, etc. Since *-ena* may indeed be a feminization of *-én* (cf. *sartana* < *sartén* < *sartagine*, according to C.), why not explain the suffix *-ena* (that appears already in the first attestations: in Berceo our word rimes with *cena*) as a reflection of Lat. *-agine* and point to the etymon *carrago*, *-inis* (from *carrus*) attested in late Latin in the meaning 'fortification or barrier made of wagons' (the German equivalent would be *Wagenburg*)? The meaning may have developed to 'protected place, refuge,' from there 'attic,' 'projecting roof,' etc. (in Berceo [the devil] *asmaba esconderse en qualque socarrena*). *Socarreña* would then originally mean 'the place under (the protection of) a fortification.'

SOPHAR. The Italian *sòffice* 'soft, weak' is given among the examples of the encroachment of **suffl-* (*sufflare*) on **suppl-* (*supplere*), but *sòffice* can only represent an invasion of *sufflare* into the domain of *supplex* which, like *simplex*, *duplex*, etc., represents the Latin word family of *plect-* (*plectere* 'to plait'). Incidentally the etymology of Italian *sòffice* with open *o* is far from clear, Battisti-Alessio to the contrary notwithstanding: *sūpplice* + *sūfflare* (> It. *soffiare* with closed *o*) should give **soffice*. There exists the parallel of It. *bòffice* synonym with *soffice*, which would indicate an influence of an onomatopoeic stem **bōff* parallel to the more usual **buff-* (cf. Sp. *bofes* 'lungs').

(DE) SOSLAYO 'obliquely.' C. proves beyond doubt that this adverb was preceded in Sp. by *en deslay(o)* and that this in turn is a **d'eslayo* borrowed from OF *d'eslais* 'impetuously' from *eslaissier*, but he is silent about the disappearance of the Fr. final *-s* (which, however, appears in the *-x* of the verb in the Aragonese ms. of the Alexandre: *byslaxôle el colpe* < *eslaissier*). Should we think that the *-s* was wrongly felt in Sp. as implying a plural or as perhaps an adverbial *-s* or perhaps was muted at the time of the borrowing (but the *ai* is preserved), or, and this seems to me preferable, that we have to start from a OF **eslaiier*, from a compound, that is, of *laiier*, the well-known abbreviated form of OF *laissier* (*lai* in the sense of 'bequest' is mentioned by Godefroy as a postverbal noun from *laiier*, but the attestations are too late to inspire confidence)? If my explanation of Port. *rêles* < Fr. *relais* is correct (and C. seems to agree to it, additions, s. v. *râlea*), this borrowing from Fr. would have taken place much later than *d'eslai(s)* > *deslay(o)*, at the time when the Fr. diphthong had given way to the *e* pronunciation.

TACAÑO. C. proves that the original meaning of the word, which is attested since the 14th century, is not 'miserly' (which meaning suggested to previous etymologists the etymology Germ. *tâhi* [mod. Germ. *zäh*] 'tough') but 'despicable person of low social rank,' 'rogue.' He then proposes a Hebrew etymology (which in itself is a rare phenomenon in Sp. lexicography): *taqânâh* 'arrangement, regulation,' more specifically 'the arrangements of the Jewish communities with the Crown about their payments,' or 'tribute,' with the suffix *-aña* developed as in Arabic *hasana* > SP. *hazaña* (but this

itself is a doubtful etymology). And now follows a speculation about the possible relationship between Gentiles and Jews in their painful cohabitation in the Middle Ages: "el hebreo proponía una *tāqānāh* o arreglo equitativo [with the King]; el cristiano entendía un chanchullo o una bajeza"—all this to prove that *taqānāh* might have given a Sp. noun **tacana* 'deceitful arrangement' which changed its suffix into *-aña*, and from there an adjective *tacaño* 'despicable person' was possible (after the model of *picaña* -*picaño*), again a laborious construction. I propose tentatively to connect *tacaño* 'despicable person' (in its first attestations the translation by 'apparitores' and 'emissarius' should be considered) with *atacar* 'to bind or hook ('*abrochar*') a garment to the body,' which verb C., s.v. *atacar*, rightly relates to *taco* 'plug, tap, heel' (because the bottoms of olden times were plugs, cf. *abrochar* from 'brooch'). We would have here a semantic parallel to *corchete* 'hook' > 'apparitor' and from this meaning the general pejorative 'person of low social rank' developed (cf. the Sp. glosses to *emissarius* quoted by C.). As to the suffix *-año*, C., s.v. *hazaña*, asserts its exclusively denominal character, but he himself admits that a deverbal function had necessarily to develop once words such as O Prov. *mesclanha*, OFr. *ovragne* (originally denominal) found themselves along with verbs (*mesclar*, *ovrer*): *tacaño* would originally have meant 'one who hooks, seizes, grips' just as *picaño* according to C. meant 'one who picks.'

TAIMADO, TEMA (Port. *teima*). The explanation of the Port. diphthong (by influence, on Lat. fr. *thema*, of such words as *rheuma*, *phlegma* has been given by me in Corominas' own journal *Anales del Inst. d. lingu. Cuyo* III, 21 (with parallels such as OF *t(e)ume*, Fr. *apostume*). Cf. also *theuma* in Du Cange.

TALENTO. C. explains the fact that in medieval Latin (Irish glosses of the 7-8th cent., Abélard—I should add Hroswitha) *talentum* developed the meaning 'intellectual gift' whereas in the vernaculars it means always 'will, mind, disposition,' by two different attitudes of the Church, or preaching on two levels: "in the popular literature of the vernaculars the Church always insisted on putting good will and natural goodness above intellectual gifts . . . while the original meaning 'intellectual gifts' remained confined to Latin literature with its more cultured and intellectualistic tone." This is one of those not too felicitous cultural speculations of Corominas'. It seems to me that for the transfer of meaning 'gift (of God)' > 'disposition, mind, will' no preaching of the Church, only the popular mind (which is, as a rule, not 'intellectualistic') is responsible: if it is said in the OF *Alexius* that the protagonist has turned his whole mind (*talent*) toward God, this is what the people understood as 'God's gift.'—I have found *talento di mangiare*, 'appetite' (the predecessor of expressions such as Prov. *talen* 'hunger') in the *Cento novelle antiche*.

TANGO. A confirmation of the brilliant explanation of the name of the originally South American dance as an onomatopoeia intended to imitate the sound of the drum as played by negroes in their dance-halls (this being the original meaning of the first attestation in Cuba 1836) can be offered by the German word *Tingeltangel* 'night-club' (attested first 1872) which is explained by Kluge-Goetze as an onomatopoeia for "Musik mit Beckenschlag und Schellen-

baum." Is there perhaps any historical connection between the Argentinian *tango* 'noisy dance meeting of negroes' and the German *Tingeltangel* 'noisy night-club'?

TECLA 'key (of a musical instrument),' originally 'key-board.' C. reports: "Imaginó Spitzer" that this word belongs to an onomatopoeic family **tec-* (parallel to *tac-toc-*) meaning 'to touch, strike' and C.'s objection is that apart from Prov. *téc(le)*, *tuc* 'myope, interdit, ébahi, stupide' (originally 'stunned as if by a blow,' cf. Fr. *toqué*) which reappears in Chile (*tecle* 'viejo temblón y caduco'), no clear evidence for this stem is found. The Prov. form would then represent a borrowing from Spanish—a highly improbable direction of the borrowing which generally follows the opposite way. But is not an onomatopoeic stem which can be expected to exist, given the parallel Romance *tac-toc-* word families, as name of an object that is expressed onomatopoeically in other languages (Fr. *touche*, Prov. *tusto*, Germ. *Taste*) a likelier explanation than C.'s own etymology: Hisp.-Arabic *tēgra* 'wooden box,' with no attestation as 'box for a musical instrument'? Surely the older meaning 'harpsichord' on which this etymology rests is secondary as is shown by the German *Klavier* 'key-board' that took the meaning 'harpsichord' in attested French phrases such as *savoir, posséder son clavier* 'to master the keyboard' > 'to master the harpsichord' (according to the convincing suggestion of Hildebrand in the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*).

TERTULIA. Since the explanations by *Tertullian* and *ter Tullius* have an anecdotal ring, I may ask whether one should not assume a long underground existence of this word that appears in print only as late as the 17th cent., and a more general meaning than that reflected in the first attestations, the *desván* of theatres where people conversed. If *tertulia* meant first 'place where people meet, converse,' could it not be a semi-learned reflection of *tractatorium*, once attested in Du C. from the letters of Apollinaris Sidonius; 'locus in quo *tractatus* seu consilia agitantur,'¹ from *tractatus* 'ὁμιλία, collatio,' 'synodus,' 'concio episcopi vel sacerdotis ad populum' (*tractatus populares, quos Gracii homilias vocant*), and this from *tractare* 'to treat a subject, discuss.' The haplology *tractoria* for *tractatoria* is attested in Du C. s.vv. *tractatoria* and *tractoria* (also *tracturias*) in the meaning 'epistola synodalis.' From *tractoria* a dissimilated form would be **tratolia* (cf. *retorica* > Sp. *retórica*), hence, with some minor alterations, as usual in half-learned words, *tertulia*. Popular representatives of *tractoria* would have given **trechera*, cf. C., s. v. *traer*.

TEZ. To C's excellent suggestion that *la tez* (attested as late as the 15th cent.) was originally *l'atez* = **apt-ities* (from *aptus* 'fit, appropriate'), applying to the color and smoothness of the human skin (*noble apteza* appears in the *Alexandre* as variant of *adapte nobleza*, meaning 'perfect') I should like to add that the semantic origin must not necessarily be 'perfection of the skin' but somewhat parallel to that of Eng. *complexion*: this meant first (like OSP. *compleción*, C., s. v. *complejo*) according to medieval physiology, 'combination

¹ Harper's translates *tractatorium*: 'a place where deliberations were held, causes tried, etc., a place of business, session-room' and *tractatus* 'a consultation, discussion.'

of the four basic qualities or humors (cold-hot, moist-dry) in a certain proportion,' 'temperament,' then the 'color and texture of the skin, esp. of the human face, as showing the temperament.' The Latin adjective *aptus* had already the nuance 'well-joined,' 'harmonious': it appears as parallel to Gr. *ἀπουστος*. Thus *aptez(a)* will have meant in OSp. 'aptitude, i.e. 'well-proportionedness, well-temperedness' ('temperament'), hence 'perfection,' 'beauty,' later 'perfection as revealed by the skin.' A side-development from 'well-temperedness' is 'robustness, strength,' cf. the Cat. text of 1489: '*la composicio* [notice the idea of 'well-ordered'] *e abtea* dels membres demostraven *valentia*.'

TINO. C., using much of Cuervo's material, points out that the verb *atinar* in Sp. as well as in Port. meant originally 'to aim at a point,' but in contrast to Cuervo he assumes that the vb. *atinar* preceded the noun *tino* and declares Cuervo's proposal **tinnulus*, 'little sound' as a 'desperate' attempt at solution of the etymological problem. Corominas then proposes as etymon of the verb the Latinism *destinare* decomposed into *des-tinare* > **ad-tinare* in a meaning 'to direct one's shooting at,' 'to aim,' which, though perhaps acceptable for certain Latin passages, is never attested in Romance (and seems very unlikely, given the absolutely learned semantic atmosphere of this Romance Latinism). I believe Cuervo to have been on the right track since the oldest examples of *tino*, *atinar* imply a being guided, in aiming, by sound, or noise. It is then quite possible, as Cuervo said, "que estas voces tuviesen más bien que ver con el concepto de oír que con el de tocar." What is missing in Cuervo's explanation is only the correct phonetic form of the *tinnire* family from which *tino*, *atinar* could be derived. Now we have both in Sp. and Port. reflexions of the Latin verb: *retiñir*, 'to resound' (C., s. v.) and Port. *tinir* (REW). If we could rely on Figueiredo's entry: "*tino*,² m. Des. [usado]. O mesmo que *tinido*" (i.e. 'sound of metal or glass'), then Port. *tino*,¹ i.e. 'judgment' (older Ptg. *tino do rumor*), could simply be identical with that *tino*,² postverbal from *tinir*. But since this solution could not be valid for Sp. where one should expect from *tiñir* a postverbal **tiño*, not *tino*, I think we must, assuming with Corominas the priority of the vb. *atinar*, derive this verb from an onomatopoeic stem **tin* (which was re-created in Sp. on the basis of the equally onomatopoeic Lat. *tintinn(i)are*: cf. the later Sp. forms of type (re)*tintín* quoted by C., s. v. *retiñir*:² *atinar*, originally *a-tin-ar*, meant then 'to follow the direction of the sound'; the noun *tino* is a later regressive formation.

TRABAJAR. C. reproduces Paul Meyer's etymology based on a Prov. form *trebalh-ar*, namely, *tripalium* in the meaning 'instrument of torture,' which is generally thought to explain the whole *travail travaglio trabajo* family. C. points out also the existence of the *tre*-forms in Catalonia, Aragon and Navarra. He has not been able to see Ch. H. Livingston's learned book "Skein-winding Reels" (Ann Arbor 1957), but I believe that he would not have accepted Mr. Livingston's explanation, especially not that part of it which uses Nicholson's arguments contra P. Meyer (since C. has repeatedly expressed his strong opposition to that amateurish etymologist). Mr. Living-

² In fact, we could assume that (re)*tintín* is a postverbal formation from *retiñir* with the same development of final -ñ as in Sp. *desdén*.

ston, in order to explain the *b-* of Prov. *trebalth*, which must go back to a Lat. *-p-*, assumes a **trapaculum* in the sense of 'rotary reel, instrument of torture,' from *trabs*, 'beam' pronounced **traps* (cf. *plebs non pleps* in the Appendix Probi), out of which there would have developed a declension **traps trapis* (after the pattern *daps dapis*), from which **trapis* a **trap-aculum* instead of the previously suggested **trabaculum* could have been found. Mr. L. has no parallel for his supposed analogical declensional system to offer because of the other words in *-bs* "none, except *trabs*, has come down into the Romance languages through really popular channels." But neither *plebs* nor *arabs* (RFW, s. vv.), which show some traces of popular survival in Romance show any *-p-* paradigm. The *-e-* of OProv. *trebalth* is explained by L. by means of the influence of OProv. *tribolar* 'to tribulate' (a learned development of Lat. *tribulare*). But the OProv. forms of this word family attested by Raynouard and Levy show an overwhelming number of *tribol-* over *trebol-* forms (the latter seem to be connected more with *trebol* < *turbulus* 'dark' and in Catalan no *trebol-* form seems to exist). And how should such a learned word influence the much more popular *trebalhar*? If then the influence of *tribulare* is eliminated it would seem that it is much easier, *pace* Nicholson, for a *trebalhar* to change into *trabalhar* (assimilation of a pretonic vowel to a tonic one) than for a *trabalhar* to develop into *trebalhar* in such a large area.

TRAFALMEJO -AS. Instead of the very complicated Arabic etyma I should ask whether we have not to do with the two elements *meque* 'vicious individual' + *trefe* 'wayward' which form *mequetrefe* (v. C., s. v.), only in reversed order (note particularly the Port. form *melcatrefe* attested s. v. *mequetrefe*) and with an assimilation of the ending to proper names of the type *Callejas*; *Salinas* etc.: **trefe(l)mejas* (about such pseudo-names and their influence on Sp. pejorative nouns cf. my article in *Bibl. Arch. Rom.* II, 2).

TRAGAR. Is the *traco* that appears in Isidore not a Latinization of Greek *τραχών* 'a rough, rugged place,' 'stony tract' (Lucian, Strabo, cf. Liddell-Scott and Sophocles) derived from *τραχύς* 'rough, stony,' which the grammarian-saint felt obliged to 'differentiate' from the nearly homonymous *draco* < *δράκων*, giving it a meaning ('cavern') which could be connected with the dragons? The derivation by C. of *tragar* (*dragar*) 'to swallow' from *draco* 'dragon' seems very unlikely to me: **dracare* 'do what the dragon does (namely; swallow human beings), ?—Has one heard of a similar simple derivative verb from *ogre*, *giant*, *beast*, *viper*, *demon*, *devil*? (In Dante we find *indracarsi* 'to transform oneself into a dragon' as we find in It. *inviperarsi*, *inserpentirse*, *intorarsi*, *imbestiarsi*—never the simplicia **viperare* **torare* **bestiare* in the sense postulated by C). Also, there is no possibility of disregarding the hint given by the *tradecando* of the glosses of Silos which clearly points, as C. confesses, to a **trad-icare*. He rejects this etymon because of the semantic difficulty and because *tradere* is only attested in Romance in the meaning 'to betray.' But perhaps *tradere* 'to hand over, to pass' may have come to mean 'to swallow' (cf. *trocir* 'to pass' > 'to swallow' particularly the example quoted by C., s. v. *trocir*: *non a* [the wafer] *trociu nen passou*)³ and in that

³ The reader hardly needs to be reminded of Mod. Span. *pasar* = 'to swallow,' as in: "Así estarán de secas [las empanadas], con tanto calor, que no eres

particular popular use produced a derivative **tradicare*. The preposition *trans-* is thus as justified as in Lat. *transglutire* and in Ital. *trangugiare*. As to the forms with initial *d-*, they may have arisen by assimilation at the time when the intervocalic *-d-* was still pronounced.

TRASCO 'goblin.' C.'s derivation from a *trasg(r)eer* or *trasg(r)eir* 'to exceed the proper measure' (<Lat. *transgredi*), attested a few times in passages of a semi-solemn nature in 15th cent. texts seems to me utterly impossible: according to him, a first-person **trasgueo* (<*transgredior*), with one *r* dropped, would have inspired the formation of an infinitive *trasguear*, and from this verb, with *travesear* as the model, there would have been created a backformation *trasgo*. In addition to the quite theoretical nature of this construction, how could one ever bridge the chasm between the courtly flavor of a verb such as *transgredi* 'to transgress a code of behavior' and the mischievous 'hobgoblin' who manifests himself by his naughty behavior?

TREFE. I think that Meyer-Lübke's rejection, in an earlier edition of his dictionary, of the Hebrew etymon *térēfa* 'un-kosher meat' was justified and that C. has done nothing toward making it more palatable. Not only is the absence of Hebrew words in the Old Romance *argots* significant (and surely the C.'s doubtful explanation of *tacaño* by a Hebrew word [s. above] is no valid parallel), but it is highly unlikely that a Hebrew word should have lost its Jewish or *argot* character as early as the oldest Troubadour poetry (Marcabré, etc.). Moreover the *trefa* = *térēfat*, found in a XVth cent. Catalan text in the meaning of 'unkosher meat,' this time applied outspokenly to Jewish dietary laws, does not prove that this Hebrew word was truly popular among the Gentiles: the fact that any American knows *kosher* to be a Jewish word does not imply that *kosher* is a genuine American word for 'ritual fool' without Jewish connotation. Finally the modern Italian forms of the type *tareffe* which seem indeed to go back to the Hebrew word speak rather for the un-Hebrew character of Sp. *trefe*, Prov. *trefá* since they render the *šewa* by a vowel. It is strange that C. when mentioning the OProv forms quotes a passage of Sainéan in which this scholar proposes rather the etymology **trefa* = *trufa* 'truffle.'

TROVAR. C. adopts my explanation from a **tropare* < *τροπολογεῖν* 'to speak allegorically, metaphorically,' but rejects the idea of the back-formation from *contropare* 'to compare texts' attested in the *Lex Visigothorum*, attributing to a 'prejudice' of mine, inherited from Schuchardt, the suggestion that **tropare* must have meant first 'to find,' then 'to compose poetry.' Why, argues C., should the meaning 'to compose poetry' not be the original one, inherited from Vulg. Lat., since we no longer believe that Provençal poetry was born with the first poem of William of Aquitaine? But I, in admitting 'to find' as the primary meaning, 'to compose poetry' as the secondary, was not indulging in a prejudice but observing the factual, historically attested trends underlying the composition of medieval poetry, trends with which C. seems to be less familiar: it is not without reason that Levy, s. v. *trobar*, lists first the meaning 'to find,' while 'to compose poetry' appears as meaning

capaz ni de *pasarlas*. Parece que estás comiendo polvorones." (*El Jarama*, R. Sánchez Ferlosio, Barcelona, 1956, p. 178).

12; similarly, in Grimm, the definition 'dichten' (which may be a loan translation from Prov.) appears as meaning no. 4 of MHG *finden*, thus testifying to the development 'to find' > 'to compose poetry'.

For we know, and not only from Curtius, that medieval poetry followed the precepts of Latin rhetoric (indeed, William of Aquitaine's poetry, in which the first example of *trobar* is found, is full of rhetorical devices) and, in Latin and Greek rhetoric, 'invention' was the most important element: Curtius, p. 75 ff. states that the *ars* of rhetoric has five parts: (1) *inventio* *speciosa*, 'Findungslehre'; (2) *dispositio*; (3) *elocutio*; (4) *memoria*; (5) *actio*, of which the first, "die Lehre von der Auffindung des Stoffes" is the most essential. "Invention," in turn, is divided into 5 parts (*exordium*, *narratio*, *argumentatio*, *refutatio*, *peroratio*); what we call 'composition' was unknown to ancient and medieval literary theory which has only recently, and never definitively, separated itself from 'Findungslehre': the *topoi* of rhetoric were a constitutive part of poetic 'invention': even music was subject to rhetoric and, as late as the Quattrocento "es gab eine musikalische Topik, usw. 'Wie oft, sagt Gurlitt, 'ist . . . eine Melodie- oder Findekunst (*ars inveniendi*, man denke an Bach's "Inventionen"), eine Rhythmusgestaltung . . . im Grunde nichts als . . . Topenschatz,"—which fact explains why for example, MHG *finden* is also used of musical composition (*Tristan êr machet unde vant / an iegelichem saitpil / leiche und guoter nôten vil*). —Incidentally, the meaning 'to agree (said of a group of persons)' which we find with the *contropare* of the Visigothic Laws is also found occasionally with **tropare* (Levy s. v. *trobar*: 10) 'einen Presis vereinbaren'), just as both *contropare* and **tropare* show in Old Romance the meaning 'to invent, to compose poetry.'

TUMULTO. The popular form *trimulto* is obviously influenced by the near-synonym *trifulca*.

UFANA 'haughtiness.' C. rejects my explanation of OProv. *ufana* 'vanity, pomp, vain appearance' from an onomatopoeic interjection **uf* = **buf* indicating the blowing up of lips, because in those areas of Romania where this *uf*! is attested (e.g. Ital. *a ufo*) the noun *ufana* is not a native word and viceversa, and because *ufana* 'haughtiness' derived from an unattested adjective **ufá*, *ufana* would be a unique formation in OProv. where our word family is first attested. Therefore he has recourse to the Gothic feminine *-n*-stem *uffjō* 'abundance, excess' which, when taken over by Romance, should appear with an *-a* ending, and this in turn would lead to an abstract fem. noun **ufán*, which then would be feminized in its form into OProv. *ufana*. The parallel offered for this series of morphological changes is however not convincing: the *n*-stem Goth. *gasalja* 'companion' > Prov. *gazalhan* 'chapelier' is the masc. name of an animate being ending in *-a* and therefore is given in Romance an *-a-anis* declension (parallel to that of Latin *-ō-ōnis*) of which *scriba* > *escribán* is another example. I am ignorant of any Germanic abstract passing to the *-an(a)* type and so must be C., since he offers only the above mentioned parallel. Now adjectives in *-á-ana* are frequent in OProv. (*bauzá*, *trefá*), and if the masc. **ufá* is by chance not attested we have the same case in OProv. *laizana* 'dirt' (obviously connected with laid 'ugly') while no masc. **laizá* is known. In such cases we may have to do with elliptical

expressions: *ufana* = *ufana* [razó] 'haughty speech' (cf. the OProv. line: *soven vus aug dir, en Gui, mant' ufana*) or *ufana* [vida] 'haughty way of life' (cf. OProv. *menar ufana*). Similarly OProv. *escura* 'darkness' < *escura* [noch], cf. Cast. *escurana* 'darkness'; also Sp. *veras* [palabras] opposed to *burlas*. From our very same stem *ufan-* Marcabru forms an *ufanesca* 'haughtiness' in a jocose coupling with the substantivized masculine *ufanesco* (cf. OProv. *velhesc* 'old age' = *velhesc* [temps]). Compare with the semantic development assumed by me the mod. Prov. (Toulouse) *boufano* 'poseur' (FEW), s. v. *buff-* which must have been, as its feminine form shows, originally a feminine abstract noun similar to *ufana*, namely **bufana*. If in OProv. only the abstract noun *ufana*, not the adjective is attested, this is in line with the abstract character of Troubadour lyrics which is mainly devoted to the praise of abstractions (of good and bad qualities): if C. cared to establish comparative statistics he would find such words as *orgolh* (*dir, far orgolh*) much more frequent than *orgolhos*; *joy* much more frequent than *joyos*. If we should procede according to the criterium that a derivative from an onomatopoea can only be admitted if the onomatopoea itself is attested in the same area, many of the onomatopoeic etyma reconstructed by C. would collapse (f. ex. the *tastar tãter taste* from an onomatopoea **tast*, as I proposed and C. confirms, while the underlying **tast-* as such has not yet been found anywhere).

USAGRE 'a certain rash, eczema' (dialectal Port. *uzagre, ozagre, asagre, anzãs(a)re*). C. reconstructs a mispronounced medical term *focus acris* with a wrong form of the adjective (*acris* instead of *acer*), with Lat. -s preserved, with the stem syllable *foc-* omitted and with *u-a-* replaced in Port. by the prefix *en-* (**enzazre* > *anzãz(a)re*)—truly an overdose of reconstruction! Would it be too daring to derive *usagre* from *bisagre* in the meaning (cf. also Fr. *bisègle, bisaille, bisagüe*) 'polishing stick of the shoemakers'? I am not quite familiar with the particular form of this tool, but if it meant a kind of 'file' the semantic transfer to 'rash, eczema' would be easy: I have often heard it said in German of parched skin: *meine Haut ist wie ein Reibeisen*. The Portuguese forms must be borrowed from Spanish.

For the labialization of the pretonic *e* after labial consonant (**bes-* > *bus-*) cf. C., s. v. *mojiganga* (< *vejiga*, dial. *boziga, buziga*): the bilabial *b-* would then have been absorbed by the *u* (**busagre* > *usagre*).—As for *bisagre*, C. has failed to discuss Gamillscheg's etymology of Fr. *bisègle*, It. *biségolo*: Lat. **bi-secus*.

PRIMAVERA, s. v. VERANO. C. believes that because I had suggested that the concept of 'spring' is, in several areas of Romania, represented by learned and, more specifically, by poetic terms, I would be ready to "applaud" the hypothesis that Sp. *primavera* (not attested before the 15th cent.) is a loanword from "the language of the Troubadours," i. e. from Provençal. But such applause would be most inconsistent on my part, since I have precisely emphasized the fact that the OProv. Troubadours had no fixed, popular term for 'spring' and, in their poetry (where spring is represented as reviving love) were forced to have recourse to paraphrases such as *lo gais temps de Pascor, lo temps novel, lo bels (doutz) temps* (cf. also the very learned phrase *lo dous termini novel* in one of the oldest troubadour poems: Marcabru, Appel 61, 12; also, *lo bels terminis*: Peire Bremon, ed. Boutière, 16, 1); *primver, primavera*

occur only in the 14th cent. didactic treatise, *Breviari d'amor*. Nor can I subscribe to C.'s theory that *primavera* was a word extant in Sp. from the beginning since C. himself proves that *verano* was up to and beyond the 15th cent. the Sp. word for 'spring,' and since the parallel Romance language show learned forms such as It. *primavera*, OProv. *vcr*, ONap. *vertempo*. It seems to me that Sp. *primavera* is a 'poetic' Italianism brought to Spain along with Petrarchism since it was Petrarch who gave the word currency in Italian. The reasons why C. grants such ancient status to Sp. *primavera* are that the phrase *primō vere* is already found in Classical Latin (but if the word derived from it occurs in Provençal only as late as the 14th cent. why should we assume that the same gap did not exist in Spain where *primavera* is attested as late as Alonso de Valencia, 1490?), that *prima vera* is found in a 10th cent. gloss originating from Spain (but the 'latency' of *primavera* is uncontested, it is its actual currency at so early a time that is doubtful) and that a word for 'spring' must have been available to the farmer: it is he who must have 'created' the term, the poets only 'repeat.' From C.'s own data it would appear that the Sp. farmer's word was *verano* (< *veranum tempus* which is in harmony with *hibernum* and *aestivum* [*tempus*]) attested four centuries before *primavera* (and differentiated from *verano* in the *Quijote* only secondarily). But the dogmatic statement that in the coinage of names of seasons the farmers must precede, the poets follow is not based on facts: there existed no popular word for 'spring' in OProv., the German words *Lenz* and *Frühling* are late replacements of the Indo-Eur. *vēr* that had disappeared, *Frühling* having been coined contemporaneously with Sp. *primavera* as late as the 15th cent. i. e. after the creation of *Spätling*, 'fall,' itself a late periphrase (among others such as *Herbst* < *harvest*) for a concept which, according to Tacitus, was missing with the Germanic peoples—just as a word for 'fall' was missing altogether in Indo-European. And the learned characters (not mentioned in C.'s article *otoño* of Sp. *otoño*, Fr. *automne*, It. *autunno*, Eng. *autumn*, as well as the late appearance of It. *primavera* and its Romance parallels is what led me to the suggestion that the names of the intermediate seasons were not as popular as those of the polar opposites 'winter' and 'summer.' It is indeed, as the Trübner dictionary points out, not said that the Germanic peoples did not always harvest in fall, but they must not necessarily have possessed a word for the season of harvesting. And it may very well be that poets and writers precede in the coinage of new terms which come to be accepted by the common people. Did not the Provençal Troubadours influence the word form of Fr. *amour* while the 'farmers' word' *ameur* was reserved for animal lust?

VERDE. To Fr. *vertugadin* borrowed from *verdugado* 'crinoline' one should perhaps add that it was influenced by Fr. *vertu*. In Brockhaus' *Konversations-Lexikon* (1908) s. v. *Reifröcke* are mentioned "die sog.[enannten] *Tugend-vardeine* (*verturgalles* oder *vertugadins*)" which term points to an even farther-going German folk-etymology **vertu-gardien*.

VIAJE II. C. finds the etymology **bi-ax-ius* (from *axis* 'axis') 'deviating from the axis' > 'oblique' the best, semantically as well as phonetically, as yet produced, but rejects it in the end because what appears natural to the 'cultured, modern man' (derivation from 'axis') could not appear so to the popu-

lar mind in early Romance, C. therefore proposes for OProv. *biais*, which shows an earlier and richer development than other Romance words of the same family, the derivation from the verb *biaissar* which in turn would be a compound of the prefix *bi-* (= *bis*) used for unsuccessful or misapplied activities and *aissar* 'to be worried' > Lat. *anxiari*. By analysing a number of Troubadour texts C. attempts to prove that "el amador que *se bi-aissa* es el que a fuerza de ansiedad o de deseo (por celos o por inclinación liviana) se aparta de lo justo, y así claudica o es inconstante" and (I am unable to decide whether this is still the same or a second hypothesis) that *se biaissar* (from *aissa* 'disgust') would first mean 'to feel disgust,' then 'to deviate.' But how can one assume a verbal coinage expressing a concept such as '*to be mis-anguished,' '*to feel misdisgust'? All these verbs ('to worry, to be anguished,' etc.) express a feeling to which standards of wrongness or rightness are normally not applied: such human feelings exist, whether they are soundly or unsoundly based. C.'s reinterpretation of Troubadour passages intended to buttress his theory seems to me to do violence to the texts: if we read in Raimon de Miraval *greu pot aver jauzimens / de dreit'amor drutz biais, / qu'ier se det et huoi s'estrais* the adjective *biais* does not mean 'inconstant' or 'unloving' (although these attitudes may be connected with the *drutz biais*), but simply 'oblique, not straightforward' (> 'the wrong kind of lover') as opposed to the *dreit'amor* which is the ideal of love for the Troubadours: in other words, just as Prov. *dreit* and Engl. *right* are taken in both senses (which we could call 'geometrical' and 'moral') so *biais* 'oblique' is taken in both meanings: 'oblique' = 'wrong.' To 'deviate' (*biaissar*) from the ideal of love is the capital sin of the Troubadour. The main reason why C. is opposed to **biarius* > *biais* is (as with *primavera*) a preconceived idea about the popular mind of the speakers of early Romance, this time one which credits them with a lesser intelligence: they would not, according to C., have been able to conceive a 'geometrical' term such as 'deviating from the axis.' But since the word family *axis* appears in popular form in the Romance languages (*essieu eje sala*) and since Eng. *axle* is connected with *Achsel*, 'arm-pit,' Lat. *axilla* (and *ala* 'wing'), we may assume that man was always able to see geometry represented in his primitive vehicles and in his body. And the Romance derivatives **bis-quadrum*, **bis-cuneus* offer testimony for the existence of the concept 'deviation from simple geometrical forms.'

VIAHAZA 'inconsiderate, sudden action,' 'diarrhea of horses.' C. establishes beyond doubt the original meaning of (*ave*) *viaraz(a)* as 'bird whose appearance by the wayside (*via*) is an omen' but then goes on to explain the last meaning, the modern meaning, by the smallness and weakness of the birds in question (since diarrhea leaves its victims weak), and the preceding meaning by the "fama de aturdidadas que tienen estas aves": hence 'inconsiderate action.' I would propose another semantic development, taking into consideration the 'ominous nature' of the wayside birds, mentioned by C. himself: from the idea 'bad omen' one could come, on the one hand, to 'inconsiderate sudden action,' on the other, to 'fear—and the somatic phenomenon accompanying fear.' Compare, for parallels, the REW s. v. *augurium*, where we find (1) Tarento *suru* 'Irrisch' (= 'will o' the wisp': from this we could imagine 'restless person' > 'inconsiderate action'); (2) Lorraine (*mal*)*aru* (*malum augurium* + *-ore*) 'fear, unrest.'

VIESCA 'forest on a mountain.' I do not understand how in the phrase *vescae frondes* 'poor, sparse foliage' the adjective should have become 'stereotyped,' thus coming to have the opposite meaning 'thick,' as supposedly reflected in the glosses ('*obscurum, densum, spissum*'). Could it not be simply that, generally speaking, a forest planted on a mountain, is uninviting, 'poor'? Compare the meaning as given for Asturia: 'sitio plantado de matas, robles, castaños y otros árboles silvestres nuevos (1), transplantados a nacidos allí.' (Incidentally, the gloss "*vescae: sunt frondes salicis tenerae*" does not show substantivization of the adjective: the sentence means *vescae* [frondes] *sunt* ... *frondes tenerae*.)

EN VILO 'suspended in the air' or 'level' (Asturias), s. v. *vil*. C.'s explanation from *vil* 'vile' > 'without stability,' then influenced by *en vago*, seems to me semantically not too convincing. As a rule, we may posit that expressions for 'in balance' may also mean the opposite 'in shaky balance' this ambivalence being inherent to the concept as such: we find an exact parallel in Ital. *bilicare* (derived by Battisti-Alessio from Lat. *umbilicus* 'navel') which means both 'to be in a balanced' and '... in a shaky position.' Now the Puertorrican *estar vilordo* 'estar en vilo, pasmado' seems to me to be not a derivative of *vilo*, but the original coinage: a direct representative of the word family treated by C., s. v. *palurdo*: Sp. *vilordo* 'heavy, lazy': Fr. *balourd*, Ital. *balordo* the latter of which has also the meaning 'dizzy' (*sbalordito* 'stunned') which is not incompatible with the ultimate etymon: Fr. *lourd* 'heavy' (cf. Prov. *lort* 'heavy, dizzy'). In other words, *en vilo*, regressive formation from *vilordo*, must have meant first ('heavy' >) 'stunned, dizzy' > 'in (shaky) balance.'

VILTROTEAR, *ibid.* The word, although said mostly of women, may have been influenced by the phrase *vil trotera*, but must not owe its origin to it (in that case would the verb not be **viltroterear*?). Perhaps **bis-trotear* with the prefix developed to *bir-* as in *la birlonga, birlocha, Litera esbirlaj* = *vislay* (s. v. *soslayo*), Arag. *barlenda* < **bis-lingua* (s. v. *viniebla*), and then dissimulation of the -r- in -l-.

VISPERA DE FIESTA. C.'s explanation of the fact that the whole day preceding a feast-day is called 'evening' "se explica por ser la tarde anterior lo que más precede a un día determinado" strikes me as too hasty; nor does the semantic parallel he offers of *mañana* ('morning' > 'tomorrow morning' > 'tomorrow') tell the whole story. We should not ignore, as C. does, the Christian medieval European climate which inspired such expressions as Eng. *Christmas Eve, Hallowe'en* = *All-Hallow-even*; * Germ. *Sonnabend* 'Saturday'; *Christabend, Weihnachtsabend, Heiliger Abend* = 24th of December (Lessing speaks of *Abend des Osterabends*, cf. Trübner); Fr. *la veille de* . . . ; Ital. *la vigilia di* . . . —as well as Spanish *vispera de* . . . Rheinfelder, *Kultspr. u. Profanspr.*, p. 450, points to the night services preceding in early Christianity the holidays and to the fasting which extended over the whole day (cf. the texts from Johannes de Janua, Alcuin, etc. in Du Cange): we would thus have the development 'the night-watch or night-service on the day preceding the

* Cf. Germ. *Abend aller Heiligen*, according to Kretschmer, *Wortgeographie*, a translation of Lat. *vigilia omnium sanctorum*.

holiday' > 'the preparations for the holiday on the day preceding it' > 'the day preceding the holiday.' But Rheinfelder has failed to mention the Jewish antecedents of this Christian development: the Jews who count the day from sunset to sunset consider the whole day preceding the Sabbath and the Feastdays as 'preparation' for the latter (and indeed the name of Friday is in the Greek New Testament *Paraskeue*, i. e. 'preparation'): on this 'day of preparation' fasting must take place in order to make the meals of the holiday more joyful by contrast (a motivation that is repeated for the Christian fasting by Alcuin, s. Du Cange). Thus all our expressions *la veille de*, *vigilia di*, *vispera de*, *Sonnabend*, *Christmas Eve* (which are distinguished from the usual words for 'evening' in these languages)⁶ are ultimately Hebraisms, translations of the type *Ereb Sabbath*, *Ereb Yom Tov*, *Ereb Pesach*, etc.

VIUDA with the accent on the -i- in assonance with -i- occurs already in the *Romance de Abenámar*.

VOS. Add to the bibliography of *vosotros* my article in *RFE* xxxi, 170 25.

VOTO. There is missing a reference to the popular expressions of the type *voto a . . .*

Y adverb. It must be due to distraction that C. parallels with *ibi* > *y* the verbal development *dormivi* > *dormi*; in the latter case it is well known that the -i- fell already in Latin—or rather, according to Bonfante, the *v*-forms, analogical after *cognovi*, never belonged to the popular stock of Latin.

ZONZO. I wonder why C. fails to mention the Italian representatives of the same word family: *andar a zonzo*, *zonzonare*, *zonzello*, -a (+ *donzello*, -a).

ZOTE. I believe that It. *zòtico* should be definitely separated from the *zutt*, *sutt*, *cutt* family, given the meaning of the former ('rude') and the suffix; Caix and REW are right in postulating Lat. *idioticus*, cf. the late Lat. *iotticus*, discussed by me in *GRM* ix, 60.

ZURITA. To the onomatopoeas rendering the sound of the dove with -u- add German *gurren* (the *Gurrelieder* of Schönberg), also *purren* (DWB). It is pointed out in that dictionary that *gurren* is used more of the wild than of the domestic dove.

* * *

The additions (pp. 897-1092) are wonderfully rich in new forms found by C. after completion of his four volumes and in new ideas that have come to him in the meantime, also in detailed discussions of the criticisms that have been voiced (including those of the present writer). Thus he has brought up the dictionary to the state of our etymological knowledge at the date of the publication of the last volume (May 1957). He has obviously been galled by the appearance of Vicente de Diego's *Diccionario etimológico español e hispánico* in 1955 (after the publication of C.'s first volume) which, according

⁶ Old German does not make a difference similar to that between *eve*—*evening*, *vispera*—*tarde*, but even there it is characteristic that *Sonnabend* was occasionally used instead of *Samstag*, *Saturdag*, when the solemnity of the preparations for Sunday was emphasized, thus in Gottfried von Strassburg's *Tristan* ("eines sunnen âbendes fruo, / dô man ze messe wolte gân"), v. Kretschmer, *Wortgeographie*, p. 463.

to the many corrections that Corominas is forced to point out, must be a wholly unreliable and premature production of a not too self-critical mind. Here are my "additions to the additions" of Corominas:

ACARRARSE 'to protect oneself from the sun, said of cattle.' Since all attempts at etymology have failed may I perhaps suggest simply a derivation from *carro* in the meaning 'to transport oneself (in a chariot)', 'to gather at a place,' cf. OF and dial. Fr. *acharier*, 'transporter, *amener en transportant*' on one hand, on the other colloquial Fr. *s'amener* 'to come to a place'?

ACEZAR and BOSTEZAR. For the etymon **oscitiare* (from *oscitare*) there seems to me to exist not the slightest justification from a morphological point of view.

ADREDE. See a new explanation of this word in a forthcoming article of mine.

BAHÍA. While in agreement with C.'s supposition of a French origin (<**baïe*, itself a constraction of **baïée*, the fem. participle of the variant **baier* of the verb *baër*, *beër*—the phonetic development *ice>ie*, testifying to the pronunciation *ie* of the OF diphthong which is preserved in mod. Fr. [*faire chère*] *lie*<*liée*<*laeta*), I do not believe that any corroboration is offered by the phrase of Rabelais cited by C., *la gueule baye et ouverte*: this is simply a graphic variant of mod. Fr. *bouche bée*<OF *beëe*.

BARRUNTAR. C. shows the impossibility of Diez' connection with Fr. *beluter*, Prov. *barrou(n)ta* and establishes the original meaning of the Sp. word as 'to spy in enemy country.' The etymology **ab-horrentare*, mentioned by C. in a casual note, cannot be taken seriously: it is prompted only by the necessity of explaining the -u- (*[a]burrantar—[a]barruntar. Apart from the fact that **abhorrentare* could, of course, only be factitive (*apacentar* 'to make pasture,' *asentar* 'to make sit, to seat'), and only mean 'to make abhorrent,' it is not likely that a verb meaning 'to act as an enemy' would have developed to 'to spy in enemy country.' With all caution I propose to relate *barruntar* (variants: *berruntar*, *barrontar*, and rather recently, *barrondar*) with the word family of *rebato*, *ronda*. The latter (old forms [ar]robda, [ar]rrolda) has been brilliantly explained (with C.'s assent) by Oliver Asín as an Arabic *rubt* plural of *rābīta* ' (attack from a) fortified sanctuary' (>OSp. *rābīta*, *rābīda*, etc.). *Ronda* in turn means 'patrol of *jinete*s who guard the castle or camp from outside and advise the army of imminent danger'>'patrol,' 'night-watch.' Now it is true that among the Span. descendants of *rubt* no -n forms are attested, but the parallel of *guisante*<*pisum sapidum* (according to C.'s excellent explanation) seems rather conclusive. As to the -o- which we should expect according to the development *rubt*>*arrodda*>*ronda*, it is present in the old Leonese forms *varronte* -ar quoted by C. (the -u- could be influenced by such verbs as *apuntar* 'to aim, to note, observe'). The simplex **runtar* would then have meant 'to patrol'>'to spy.' As for the first syllable of *barruntar* *berruntar*, I would not hesitate to identify it with the prefix *bis-* which is more widespread in Sp. than C.'s index of Latin prefixes (which mentions only *viage* and *viniebla*) gives us to understand: not only do we have *bisnieto*, *bisojo*, and the words mentioned above s.v. *viltrotear*, but I believe also that *barrumbada* 'noisy parly,' *barrumbar* 'decir *barrumbadas*,' represent not *rumba*+*bulia* *bullicio*, but a **bis-* formation that underlines the pejorative

meaning of the simplex *rumbar* 'to boast, to behave ostentatiously.' The same prefix *bis-* would have been added to **runtar* in order to emphasize the concept of 'entrevoir, (cf. Fr. *dévue* and the Romance type **bis-luca*), of half-discerning, involved in 'spying.'

BOGAR. C. now accepts my etymology (*vocare*). It still remains, however, to be proven that Vidos, *Neophilologus* 27, 183 is wrong in attributing to Fr. *voguer* an older ancestry than to the parallel Prov. and Ital. words. He attests *voguer* once in one ms. of Villehardouin (†1212)—but, of course, this historian of the crusade may have used a Mediterranean word. As to the Lat. *vogatium super fluvium Ligerim* in a papal bull of 1049 quoted by DuC. as a kind of toll on navigation, its interpretation by Vidos as a Fr. **voyage* (**vogaticum* or **voyagium*) seems to me arbitrary: no **voyage* (like *péage*) exists in OF and the Latinization itself is strange. I wonder if this *vogatium* has not to do with that *vocation* in Du Cange 'res, possessio, in quam aliquis vocem, seu jus habet . . . vide vox 4.'—As a parallel maritime term that made its way to France from the South I would mention OF *acesmer* 'to arrange, equip'—if A. Pézard, *Rom.* lxxviii, 519 ff. is correct, as seems likely to me, in explaining this as a nautical term of Greek origin (*ad-celeusm-are*): ". . . les verbes *accismare* et *acesmar* sont entrés d'abord dans les langues méridionales (provençal et italien) et ensuite dans le français, par la grande voie de la mer, des ports et des arsenaux."

CASAR. I think that neither the meaning 'to build a house' nor 'to take sb. to one's house' (as in Germ. *heimen* < *heim* which has the connotation of 'home') is the original one since the transitive sense 'to give in marriage one's (son or daughter)' remains thus unexplained. If one sees in the *Cid* how important it is for the protagonist to marry his daughters himself (*con mis manos*) one will conclude that this is the basic meaning: *casar* (cf. also Ital. *accasare*) 'to provide somebody with a (separate) house' (a formation of the type of Fr. *approvisionner*). From the passive participle *casado* 'provided with a house = married' a backformation *casar* intransitive 'to get married' could arise after the pattern of *nacido*—*nacer*. The later reflexive construction *casarse* could develop at the time when the *patria potestas* was no longer the only reason for marrying: = 'to marry oneself.'

CORARDE. C. rejects my theory: *cobarde* *coward* *coward*, originally name of the hare who raises his (insignificantly developed) tail when fleeing, because of "la explicación por antitesis." He himself, however, mentions a similar formation s.v. *espalda*: Cat. *espatllat* 'el que tiene la espalda desconyuntade, estropeado': lit. 'one who has something the matter with his shoulder that makes it conspicuous.' With such adjectives, characterizing parts of the body, the size of the part is less important than its conspicuousness. B. Hasselrot *Étude sur la formation diminutive* (1957), p. 153, reports the following anecdote: "Je me rappelle avoir entendu (en suédois) la phrase suivante: 'Regardez donc le type aux cheveux!' En fait, le garçon ainsi désigné avait été pratiquement rasé" in order to explain the double meaning in Romance of the type *nasone* = 'l'homme au nez remarquable (soit par sa grandeur, soit par sa petitesse).'

DESTEBRECHAB. Add to the OProv. phrase in Marcabru *motz entrebrescar* 'to

confuse words' and the Ital. *intrebeschare* 'parlare forestiero, p.es. come i Tedeschi' (Petrocchi, s. v., under the line).

ECHAR DE MENOS, s.v. *echar*: C. offers, in order to counter my objection against the theory of a borrowing from Ptg.-Gallego *achar de menos* (I had objected that I was unable to visualize the cultural situation in which such a borrowing should have taken place) the following 'cultural picture': "... es bien conocida la fama de 'ratiños,' calculadores a económicos, de que disfrutaban gallegos, asturianos y trasmontanos en Portugal . . . y en todo el mundo ibérico, y no lo es menos la norma como el gallego de extracción popular suele mezclar inextricablemente su lengua nativa con el castellano, cuando habla en este idioma: claro que al oír tantas veces *achando menos* algo cuando *echaba* sus cuentas, el hombre de Castilla, Andalucía y América (más despreocupado o indolente en asuntos así) acabaría por imitar la frasecita, aunque identificando claro está, este *achar* con su *echar* propio . . ." Imitation of foreign speech occurs in all the languages of the world, either when their speakers consider the foreigners or the foreign speech as superior or, on the contrary, when they consider it inferior: in the first case there will be born a loanword with a nuance of respect, in the second one with a nuance of contempt or parody. I would exemplify for the first case with German *kalkulieren* 'to calculate' (instead of the German *rechnen*) which was taken over by merchants from the superior Latin, for the second the colloquial German *raisonnieren*, taken from Fr. *raisonner* in the meaning 'to offer petty or insufficient objections' (as the French are supposed to do). Now *echar de menos* belongs obviously to the words of the Sp. language that have no parodistic or despective connotation; if it had it would have to mean something in the vein of 'to find fault (in the way of the Gallegos).' But *echar de menos* is a quite neutral word and why the Spaniards who have an *echar* that is used in 'accounting' should not have used in our phrase their own word is *a priori* difficult to imagine. If only C. abstained from *ad hoc* cultural speculations!

ENCINTA. C. is sometimes truly impermeable to evidence contrary to an explanation of his. I offered him proofs for *incincta* truly meaning 'girdled' in late Latin texts, referring to ribbons blessed by the Madonna or saints that were worn by pregnant women—but apart from remarking that this usage is otherwise unknown in the Greco-Roman world (but if it is attested in late Latin such an attestation should suffice!) he declares these attestations to be secondary: "the women in question wore ribbons because the word *incincta* existed, and this *incincta* must go back to *inciens* because there is no linguistic reason against *inciens* becoming altered into *incincta*!" But why gratuitously assume a *Wortaberglaube* prompted only by the desire to justify a more complicated etymology (*inciens* > *incincta*)?

ESTAFAR. C. is probably right in objecting to my explanation that this word could not have arisen in Spain where the Italianate form does not show the meaning 'stirrup.' Thus the development must be an Italian one. But he seems to be wrong in upholding his own semantic explanation, ignoring my German parallels 'sich vom Stegreif nähren,' 'Ritter vom Stegreif.' The difference between the 'sturdie beggars' who 'begge in the imperative mood' (Percivale) and the robber-barons is indeed very slight. (The Spanish phrase

caballero de estafa for which C. asks evidence comes from an unimpeachable source: Dámaso Alonso, writing about the Cid!)

ESTANDARTE. The main reason why I do not believe in the etymon: Frankish **stand hart*! is that this phrase is neither attested nor likely to have existed: we have perhaps a MHG phrase *sich einem hart halten* 'hartnäckigen Widerstand leisten,' but with *stehen* the current adverb is *fest* (MHG *faste*, used precisely in the sentence in which the German folk-etymology for *Standarte* occurs, v. Kluge). But even if **hart stehen* were an accepted idiom in Frankish, we must wonder why German abandoned a native **stand-hart* 'standard' only to bring in later a Romance loan word (which *Standarte* undoubtedly is) borrowed from Germanic. In this situation I see much less difficulty in postulating as etymon V Lat. **standalis* (from a Germanic *stand* hitherto not attested in Romance) in which the suffix was later replaced by *-ard*: we are all agreed in deriving Fr. *effrayer* from **ex-frid-are* while the stem *frid-* = *Friede* 'peace' is not attested in Romance. And I do not see how *Durandal* (the form of the *Roland*) > (the later form) *Durandart* should be a parallel to C.'s assumed transition from *estandard* to *estandal*: it is rather a parallel to my **standalis* > *estandard*. C. also ignores my parallel example OF *fauçard* < *faiz*, the name of an object derived by means of the suffix *-ard*. The only analogy to **stand-hart* > *étandard* would be the OF name of a weapon *guisarme* if we were to believe the explanation from a German phrase **weis-arm*, meaning 'lead the arm,' according to Gamillscheg or 'lead, oh arm!' according to C. (s.v. *bisarma*). But these explanations are highly problematical. Gamillscheg finds an analogy in the name of a sword *Fineguerre* which occurs once in the *Violette* romance of Gilbert de Montreuil: Godefroy lists the passage in which it is explained to us that a heavy blow with the sword gave it that name, and he translates 'finisseuse de guerre'—this being the folk-etymologic explanation that the OF poet wished to give us. But a glance at Langlois' *Table* shows us that *Fineguerre* < *finie la guerre*! is not the 'real' etymology of this sword-name, which is in fact an extension from other sword-names such as *Finmonde* < *finis mundi* the sword being called 'final destruction' (cf. the parallel sword-name *Finechamp*), and therefore can not represent the pattern on which *guisarme* < **weis-arm* may have been formed. Moreover, an imperative addressed to a part of the human body, not to the instrument which the human body should wield (C.'s hypothesis: 'lead, oh arm!'), seems to me an impossible designation of the instrument; and, in Gamillscheg's explanation ('lead the arm!'), it is unlikely that a weapon should lead (instead of be wielded by) the arm.

FRESA. C. is right in rejecting the current explanation of Fr. *fraise* = *fraie* (< *fraga*) + *framboise*, but his own explanation: **fragaria* > **fraäre* > *fraire* > *fraise* (like *chaïere* > *chaïre chaise*) suffers from the fact, granted by himself, that *fraise* appears as early as the 12th cent., at which time neither the contraction of the two first syllables nor the *r* > *s* development are possible. Would it not be better to assume a contamination *fraie* + *cerise*?

Germania FOLLOSAS 'calzas,' s.v. *fuelle*, is thought to be a derivative from *fuelle* 'bellows'; and argot Fr. *fouillouse* 'purse, pocket,' is declared to be a Hispanism. But Sainéan lists an argot variant *feuillouse* which shows derivation from *feuille*: "proprt., feuillue (anc. fr. *fuilleus*), c'est à dire à doublure."

The Germanic word is then either an independent development from *fuelle* or borrowed from Fr. argot *feuillouse fouillouse*.

GALLOFA. C. reproaches me for my too rosy picture of the Middle Ages when I object to the etymon *Galli offa* 'a Frenchman's bite,' a phrase supposedly originating from Spanish monks who taunted French pilgrims, and admonishes me to think of the 'almas vulgares,' depicted by Lull and Berceo, who must also have been represented in the medieval convents. But all this psychological speculation is contrived *ad hoc*, in order to bolster up an etymological phantasy of Couarrubias whom C. usually does not take so seriously. C. detaches arbitrarily the Sp. word from the French word-family with which Sainéan (*Sources indigènes* I, 26-33: "Histoire d'un mot" [sc. *goinfre*]) had connected it, his reasons being that Sp. *gallofa* 'piece of bread offered to beggars' is attested 70 years before *gallofo* 'beggar' and that only in Sp. the former meaning is attested. But his theory forces C. to assume that Fr. *gaiofre* 'nag' (<'hungry, lean horse'), attested in 1207, must be borrowed from Sp., an unusual direction of the borrowing process in that period, and to separate our Sp. *gallofo* -a from the whole French series of proper names and appellatives meaning 'voracious' (said of the devil, of giants, the Saracens, etc.): *golafre*, *galifre*, *galafre* (*gouliafre* in G. de Coincy, 12th cent.) which word-family, according to Sainéan, is the result of the combination of different words such as *gula*, *Goliath*, *calipha*,⁶ *galer*. I should think that the semantic degeneration of the word family from the 'voracious giants' of the French *chansons de geste* and *romans de chevalerie* to the 'hungry beggar' (and his food) in 14th cent. Spain and Italy is sufficiently explained by the fact of borrowing itself which so often entails deterioration of meaning.—For the etymology of such a word-family as this, only a *Massenstrategie* à la Schuchardt or Sainéan can bring light.

GAYO. C., understandably, sometimes stiffens when his explanation is rejected by a critic: he finds *more* reasons for it than before and more reasons against another explanation which he had before rejected only mildly. Thus he had rejected Sainéan's and my own proposal of *gayo* < *Gaius*, the name of the *jay*, only on the grounds that a basic notion such as gaiety could not be expressed by the name of a not too well-known bird, but had agreed that no phonetic or semantic objections existed. Now, in the additions, there are raised a new phonetic objection (in Prov. *gaius gaia* 'gay' from Lat. *gaius* -a 'jay' would have given **gai gaja*—but why should a feminine not take over the form of the masculine, cf. Fr. *vert* > fem. *verte*?) and a new semantic objection (that the voice of the jay could not well be interpreted as 'gay'—but I was speaking of the irregular movements of the bird which may have been interpreted as manifesting carefree gaiety). C. complains of my failure to accept as proof for his *gai* < *gaudium* the 18 cases of the same nominal form serving as adjective and abstract noun—but if cases such as *alegre* adjective and noun prove anything they testify to substantivization of adjectives, not to the reverse (*gai* noun > *gai* adjective). As to names of mountains *Mongai* which should testify for *gai* = *gaudium* there is found *Montalegre* in a parallel function not only

⁶ It seems to me significant that the — obviously tertiary — borrowing Neo-Greek *γαλοῦφος* 'flatterer' (C.) has alongside a *γαλίφος* (Mitsotakis) which corresponds to the OF *Galifre* attested by Sainéan.

in Spain, but also in Sicily (in a place name *Montallegro*) and such mountains may have been called 'gay' not because they make a gay impression, but because of the gaiety of those who climb them (the same psychology that underlies *Mons Gaudii* > *Montjoie*). And finally why would only the adjective *gai* that is etymologically controversial be identical with the noun *gaudium* (> **gaui* > *gai*), but *gaug*, which clearly goes back to *gaudium*, never show an adjectival meaning?

GOLLERÍA. C. objects to my derivation of OPort. *iguaría* (XIVth cent.) 'equal portion' > mod. Port. 'tidbit, choice morsel' from *eguar* < *aequare* by means of the suffix -*aria*, the recent date of such coinages, especially of deverbal ones ("in Portuguese, not in French"). But the type *cavallaria* is found in Portuguese Latin as early as 1218 (Cortêsão, s. v.) and the deverbal formation *sacaria* 'false alarm' ('rebate falso, para revista de tropas antes de combate') from *sacar* 'fazer sair' is listed by Figueiredo as "ant.", i. e. Old Portuguese.

INGRIMO (INGRVM) 'lonely' (Amer. Sp.), 'steep, said of a mountain' (Port.). C.'s objections to my former explanation (as backformations from a Latin *necromantia nigromantia*) have convinced me, but my vote against OF *engrami* *engremi* 'sad' still stands. In his additions, C. suggests a new explanation: a blend of the OF *engremi* with another OF word which is itself an etymological puzzle: *encrisme encri(e)me*, translated in Tobler-Lommatzsch 'arg, schurkisch.' In an overwhelming number of cases we find this adjective coupled with (and generally preceding) *felon*, therefore called by Foulet in the glossary to the Roland (*suz cel nen at plus encrisme felon*) a "kind of superlative" of *felon*; *encrisme* is found more rarely with *maufé* 'devil' and *traître*. The word is generally spelt with -s- and -i- (and is found in a 13th cent. text in rhyme with *meisme*), but is also, in the 13th cent., written *encrime* and *encrieme*. The latter form found in rhyme has prompted G. Paris' etymology **intremidus* = *intrepidus* + the stem of *criembre* 'craindre'; this is repeated by Lommatzsch. The form *engrieme* (*felon*) found in *Ogier le Danois* is for C. proof of the contamination *encri(s)me* 'fellow' + *engremi* 'sad' which would pave the way for the Pyrenean forms—in other cases C. is less lenient toward hypotheses of contamination between words semantically not absolutely identical. As to the etymon of *encrisme encrieme*, C. suggests a Lat. **incriminis* formed from *incriminatus* after the pattern of *inanimis-inanimatus*, which seems to me not quite convincing ('an incriminated fellow' fails to possess the 'superlative' quality which f. ex. 'a convicted fellow' would have). Neither does the frequency of the -s- spelling (-s- also in the *Roland*, which seems not yet to reflect the pronunciation, attested in Chrétien, of muted -s-) speak in favor of **incriminis*. Thinking of such parodistic coinages as *arch-knave*, *arch-wag*, *arch-felon* coined after the type *archbishop*, *archpriest*, Fr. *filon fieffé*, *goutteux fieffés* (Rabelais) following the lead of *huissier fieffé* or Rabelais' own coinage *fou gradé nommé en folie* (after *licencié*, *gradé en*, etc.) I would think that *encrisme felon* is a parody of *évêque*, *roi encrisme*, in which the adjective is a postverbal from **encrismer* **encresmer* 'to anoint' (in the FEW *encremere* and *cresmer* are attested), a verb itself derived from OF *crisme cresme* 'le saint chrême.' An 'anointed felon' would parody the 'anointed bishop (king)' and the meaning would be 'an arch-felon, a notorious felon, a felon possessed of all the pseudo- dignity of a felon,

The adjective must already have been stereotyped at the time of the Roland although its humorous nuance may still be present in the passage of the Roland dealing with an infidel. The fact that we find in OF only the pejorative meaning may be paralleled by the situation of *arrant* in present-day English (*arrant*, originally laudative: *knight errant*, is only pejorative now: *arrant thief*, *arrant fool*) and also by the adjective *arch* 'sly, cunning' which has developed from *arch-knave*. In such cases the parodistic terms kill the words that are parodied. The *ie* forms may be due to a contamination of *encri(s)me* (from *encrismer*) and *encre(s)me* (from *encresmer*). The *-gr-* form is comparable to so many cases of the type *craticula* > *grille*. When the Pyrenean languages borrowed the OF word they may have developed the meaning from 'arch-(knave)', 'chief-(knave)' to 'unique', 'lonely, alone' (*castanha lngreme* 'la que está sola en el erizo') and to 'steep, said of mountains.' We could by this hypothesis avoid that of a contamination and retrace the Pyrenean words to OF *encrisme* alone.

LOCUAZ. About *interlocutor*, *interlocuteur* etc. v. earlier attestations in my article in *Le Fr. Mod.* xxii, (1954), 89.

LIDÓN 'natural, unadorned' is related by C. with *litus*, 'rubbed, polished,' participle from *linere*, but the *i* (not changed into *e*) and the suffix *-ón* remain unexplained. I would think of a **nid-one* 'nestling' (formed like Sp. *perdigón* from *perdiz*; in Fr. dialects we find parallel reflections of **nid-one*: *nion*, *gnon*, FEW, s. v. **nida*), developed to 'naïve' (cf. Fr. *niais* < *nida*) and then to 'natural'; cf. the dissimilation *n — n > l — n* in Port. *ninhada* 'nest' > *linhada* (REW, s. v. *nidus*). *Litone* in the oldest Latin attestation of the word may be a false re-Latinization.

(COMER) DE MOGOLLÓN 'to eat scot-free' < Lat. *medulla* 'marrow' > 'crumbs of bread.' I would explain the semantic transfer, not by way of 'to eat rapidly as one does with crumbs' (does one?), but of 'to eat even the crumbs' > 'voraciously.'

mútis s. v. *muda*. C. has failed to render my thought adequately.

QUERER 'to love.' My remarks (which C. had seen in ms.) have not been published in the 3° series of glosses to his dictionary published in *MLN*, but in "Syntactica und Stilistica, Festschrift für E. Gamillscheg" (Tübingen 1957), pp. 579-8. C. brushes away my explanation (which takes into account the medieval and ancient concept of 'love' as a 'desire') as being "harto metafísica," as belonging to "regiones nebulosas," thereby espousing the crudest possible antiphilosophical approach of a bygone age of positivism which used 'metaphysical' as a pejorative epithet. I should invite him to open just for a moment a book such as the *Leys d'Amors* (ed. Anglade, I, 69) where he will read: *Amors es bona voluntatz / Plazers e deziriers de be. . .* That the feeling of love is considered by medieval writers mainly as desire can be proven by such famous lines of Dante as in the episode of Paolo and Francesca where the doves, the traditional symbols of love, are said to be driven by 'desire' and 'will.'

Quali colombe dal disio chiamate,
con l'ali alzate e ferme al dolce nido

vegnon per l'aere dal voler portate,
cotali usciro della schiera dov 'è Dido.

And in the same vein Lope in a *romance* points to the indissoluble tie of love between turtle-doves as showing the subjection of the 'will' by the God Amor:

Voluntades que avasallas,
Amor, con tu fuerza y arte,
¿quién habrá que las aparte . . . ?

The noun *voluntad* is found as late as the 16th cent. in the meaning of 'sympathy, love': *El emperador por la voluntad que siempre a Madrid tuve*. . . (López de Hoyos); *la grande voluntad que me has mostrado* (Alvar Gómez), passages quoted for other reasons by Dámaso Alonso, *BRAE* xxxvii, 240 and 269—and from such a use is to be semantically explained the Murcia *volunto* 'querer, cariño' (from *volunta* fem. = nom. *voluntas*), mentioned by C. s. v. *voluntad*. If C. would reconsider his stand he would recognize that the parallelism of development in noun (*voluntad*) and verb (*querer*) makes an explanation which would only be valid for the verb (*querer bien a* > *querer a*) impossible.

Incidentally, we find already in the Vulgate a *velle* in a meaning similar to 'love': Blaise, *Dict. lat.-fr. des auteurs chrétiens*, s. v. volo: 'aimer quelqu'un, se complaire en lui (Ps. 21, 9 [cf. Ev. Matthaii 27, 43]: 'salvum faciat eum quoniam voluit eum')'.

REGOJO. 'heel of the loaf of bread.' C.'s explanation from *coza* 'thigh' seems absolutely sure, cf. the Germ. *Keule* 'mace' > 'leg, joint, drumstick' used in the Franconian dialect in the meaning 'heel of the loaf of bread' (Kretschmer, *Wortgeographie*, p. 255).

REQUETE. I do not believe that Lope's phrase *reviejo y catarreviejo* can buttress the etymology of *requete*. . . < *qué tarre* < *qué tan re* -; the second word is an obvious deformation of *tatar*(*abuelo*) with dissimilation *t* - *t* > *c* - *t* as in Germ. *Kartoffel* < *Tartoffel* (< *tartufe*). For the origin of the *requete*- prefix I may than tentatively suggest a connection with that gradation which C. himself in his article on *tatarabuelo*, *tataranieto* mentions (*An. del Inst. de lingu. Cuyo* I, 149): *malo*, *remalo*, *tataramalo*: a combination of *tatar*(*a*)- and *re*- in reverse order, must have given *retata*- > (dissimilated) *recata* > *requete* (with assimilation of the *a* vowels to *re*-). On the origin of *tatar*- in *tatarabuelo* < *trans-tran*- v. Corominas.

SABER: on the nuances of O Fr. *savoir* bordering on *pouvoir* cf. my article in *Arch. Rom.* VIII, 371.

* * *

The *magnum opus* of Professor Corominas includes carefully worked-out and reliable indices, not only of the non-Spanish words treated (for the Spanish words appear of course in alphabetical order), but also of the linguistic (phonetic, morphologic, lexicologic) phenomena mentioned in the different articles of the dictionary, of the passages drawn from authors which have been commented upon or emended, and of the corrections proposed to standard works of Romance philology such as *REW*, *FEW*, etc. Among the word indexes the Latin part seems to me not to be fully exhaustive (v. above my remark on

bis-) and I miss also an index of the dialectal Spanish words that are so often treated under the Spanish standard forms: Gallego and Mozarabic have here been given a preferential treatment which other dialects of Spain would also seem to deserve. As a farewell note to the reader, Corominas offers a list of the exact dates (years and months) when the different parts of the dictionary were written and published: it took the great scholar ten years (1947-1957) to write and it took the energetic publisher Francke only three years 1954-1957) to publish a monumental work to which generations of scholars will have recourse—especially if, as we may predict from the current trends of facile descriptivism in contemporary linguistics, the day will come when one scholar no longer exists who is capable of handling the whole vocabulary of a family of languages: a scholar endowed with the necessary comparative-historical preparation and talent, and the genius of intuition, which allows him to assign their due place to thousands of words and their phonetic-semantic ramifications.

The Johns Hopkins University

LEO SPITZER

Ein paar Kleinigkeiten zu den Gedichten des Heinrich "von Melk."

'Erinnerung' 98:¹ *sîn gehugde wirt êwîchlich verswîget*. Vgl. Psalm 33.17 *vultus autem Domini super facientes mala: ut perdat de terra memoriam eorum*.

'Er.' 397: *die nîgent sam um(b) ein rat*. Diese Wortstellung der Hs., die Heinzel beibehalten hat, ändert Kienast² in "*nîgent umb sam. . .*" Ich denke, die Wortstellung der Hs. lässt sich wohl vertreten. Hat man eine bildliche Darstellung vor Augen, wie etwa die leicht zugängliche in der Ausgabe der *Carmina Burana* von Hilka und Schumann (Bd I. 1, Tafel 1), so ist eine Ausdrucksweise wie "sie beugen sich wie um ein Rad" gerechtfertigt; der Dichter denkt hier, wie Kienast (l. c., Anmerkung zur Stelle) bemerkt hat, nur an das Absteigen, d. h. auf das genannte Bild übertragen, nur an dessen rechte Seite.

'Er.' 398/399: *Rôme aller werlde hauptstat, / diu hât ir alten vaters nicht*. Diese Verse geben m. E. einen Anhaltspunkt zur Datierung des Gedichtes. Der Papst Alexander III. musste nach der Niederlage der mit ihm verbündeten lombardischen Städte 1161 nach

¹ Verszahlen nach R. Heinzel, *Heinrich von Melk* (Berlin, 1867).

² Der sogenannte *Heinrich von Melk* (Heidelberg, 1946).

Frankreich fliehen; 1165 konnte er nach Rom zurückkehren. Daraus ergibt sich ein etwas späterer zeitlicher Ansatz als der bisher allgemein angenommene (Ehrismann, *Gesch. d. deut. Lit.*, II. 1, 187 "etwa um die Mitte des 12. Jhs."; de Boor, *Gesch. d. deut. Lit.*, I, 174 "zwischen 1150 und 1160," aber *ibid.*, p. 135 "um 1160"). Ist mit dem "abt erchennen fride" (991, nach Kienasts Zählung 1033) wirklich jener Erkanfrid gemeint, der 1122 bis 1163 Abt des Klosters Melk gewesen ist, so ergibt sich für das erste der beiden Gedichte Heinrich's eine Entstehungszeit von 1161-1163. Es bleibt freilich zu beachten, dass die Fürbitte des Dichters für diesen Abt, "den habe dû, hêrre, in dînem fride" (992), sich sehr wohl auch auf einen Toten beziehen kann. Doch wird man das Gedicht schwerlich noch später ansetzen können.

'Er.' 467: (*mîn leben ist . . .*) *sam ein wazzer daz dâ hin strichet*. Heinzel hat in seiner Anmerkung mit der Einschränkung "etwas anders" auf Iob 11.16 verwiesen, Kienast (Anmerkung z. Stelle) zieht, ebenfalls etwas unsicher, Iob 6.15 heran. Am nächsten steht m. E. Iob 14.11 *quomodo si recedant aquae de mari, et fluvius vacuefactus arescat: 12 sic homo cum dormierit, non resurget. . .*

'Er.' 629: (*dem dû ê die siden in daz hemde*) *mûse in manigen enden witen*. So die Hs. Heinzel hat in "wîten" geändert, was keinen rechten Sinn ergibt. Kienast ändert in "witten," wofür er das ahd. Verbum "wittôn" heranzieht; im Mhd. ist das Verbum nicht zu belegen. Ich denke, man kann in dem "witen" der Hs. das im Mhd. gut belegte Verbum "wêten" sehen. Der Vokal ist durch den Reim geändert wie in 'Priesterleben' 518/519 *lebt :.phlegt* (statt *phligt*).

'Priesterleben' 68: *nâch dem wine hært daz bibelinum*. Die von Kienast (Anm. zur Stelle) als "wahrscheinlich richtig" bezeichnete Ansicht von Baunack (*ZfdA.* 58, pp. 239 seq.), *biblinum* sei gleich "wîbelîn," ist gewiss nicht richtig, wie sich aus dem Zusammenhang ergibt. Das Sprichwort wird nämlich "phaffen" und "nunnen" zugeschrieben; die von Baunack herangezogene Stelle Freidank 16.16/17 spricht ausschliesslich von "phaffen." Sollte es sich bei dem umstrittenen Wort nicht etwa um eine bewusste Entstellung von "biblia" handeln? Der zweite Teil des Sprichwortes wäre dann auf die Unsitte zu beziehen, dass nach üppigen Gastereien und Gelagen geschwind und ohne innere Sammlung die vorgeschriebenen geistlichen Uebungen abgeleistet wurden.

Marburg

ERNST A. EBBINGHAUS

"Tougen Minne" in the *Genesis*?

*tougen minne diu ist guot
si kan geben hôhen muot*

These two lines of an anonymous Minnesang strophe (C. von Kraus, *Des Minnesangs Frühling*, 30. Aufl., 1950, p. 1) contain two formulas which have long been regarded as central to the whole picture of the conventions surrounding courtly love as we know it from Middle High German literature in the *Minnesang* corpus: *tougen minne* and *hôher muot*. The aim of the courtly poet is to attain to a state of *hôher muot* and our poet's precept, a generally accepted one, is that one way, at least, to do this is through *tougen minne*. It is with the idea of secrecy as revealed in the *Genesis* some hundred years before the first *Minnesang* strophes¹ that I wish to deal in this short note. The theme occurs in a highly significant passage which treats the story of the relationship of Joseph and Potiphar's wife and which reads as follows:—

Do iz Ioseph also wole ane ufe
und ime an nihte missege,
do begunde er siner urowen lichen.
si wolte in besuichen,
si begunde getougen
an in werfen dei ougen.
si têt wider in dei gebære
dei ime waren unmare.
si begund in spenen
und unrehtes wenen.
wenen daz netohte,
ub si uore gote mahte.
Do si iz langere nemahte uerhelen,
do begunde si zû ime spilen.²

The corresponding passage in the Vulgate reads:—*Post multas itaque dies iniecit domina sua oculos suos in Ioseph . . .* where no mention is made of secrecy in Potiphar's wife's approach to Joseph.

Certainly the idea of secrecy in love and love-making is not unfamiliar nor unexpected in the contemporary Latin verse: for example, in the Cambridge Songs the lover speaks of seeking out secret places

¹ V. Dollmayr: *Die altdeutsche Genesis nach der Wiener Handschrift* (ed. Dollmayr), Altddeutsche Textbibliothek 31, Halle (Saale), 1932; Introduction p. viii: "Das in Hss. des 12. Jahrhunderts überlieferte Gedicht stammt wahrscheinlich aus der zweiten Hälfte des 11. Jahrhunderts."

² *Op. cit.* II, 3747-3760.

in the wood³ and an analysis of the vocabulary of the *Carmina Burana*, admittedly poems of later and wider provenance shows a great wealth of words like *secreta*, *arcana* etc. all of which refer to love or the venue of love-making. But Middle Latin love-lyric springs from, at least, a partly different source from the vernacular. There is, however, one more word in the passage which strikes a familiar chord for the student of the Middle Latin lyric, the word *spilen*. The term *ludere* is constantly recurring in the *Carmina Burana* and other Middle Latin love lyrics as a synonym for *amare*,⁴ though usually with a strong physical connotation and referring to the act of love or the preliminaries to it. The translation of *spilen* in the present text is not so straightforward as there is a lack of parallel contexts in the works of this period: it probably means "to make up to him," and represents some definite physical advance made by the woman.

The semantic problems posed by the passage are made even more complex by the relation of the term *minnen* to the whole process: for, after Potiphar's wife has failed to seduce Joseph, the poet goes on:—

*Also er ire intran
unt ir lie das lachen
unde si wart innen
daz er si newolte minnen* (ll. 3801-3804)

where *minnen* can only have the meaning of "to make physical love to," a meaning which the poet has already used when describing the relationship of Jacob and Leah (ll. 2597-2601):—

*Iacob und Lia
heten ire minne
die naht lange
mit chonelicher wunne*

where the meaning is quite unequivocal.

Thus we find in this poem a group of expressions which are later to become the permanent stock-in-trade of the Middle High German lyric poet or which already form part of the tradition of the *Vagantenpoesie*, used in close juxtaposition, but with a set of meanings which are clearly different from those which they develop within the

³ *The Cambridge Songs*, ed. Karl Breul (England: Cambridge, 1915), No. 33:
*ego fui in silva
et dilexi loca secreta.*

⁴ Cf. *Carmina Burana*, ed. A. Hilka and O. Schumann (Heidelberg, 1941), I, 2: 142, 2.1 *Stant prata plena floribus, in quibus nos ludamus!* 152, 3, 2 *Phebus Daphnem sequitur, Europa tauro luditur.*, etc. etc.

Minnesang context, at least after the establishment of Provençal influence upon it.

It is also significant that Ehrismann has observed that the character of Joseph in the *Genesis* is definitely that of a nobleman: "*In Joseph aber hat der deutsche Dichter außerdem einen besonderen Typus seiner Zeit dargestellt, nämlich den Edelmann.*"⁵

Much has been written of the popular traditions which form a basis to the Minnesang, and though it is arguable that the rhyme *getougen/ougen* is as obvious as *herz/schmerz* the whole passage is an adumbration of the poet's source and must therefore be regarded as of significance for the literary historian. No attempt is being made to reach any conclusion on the *tougen minne topos* in the Minnesang, but the use of these numerous components of the field of meaning of "love" in Middle High German in a poem of the late eleventh century is, to say the least, of great interest, if not highly revealing for the pre-history of the Minnesang.

University of Sheffield

KENNETH J. NORTHCOTT

Submerged Heroism

Elisabeth Langgässer's Story: *Untergetaucht*

Of the eighteen short stories and sketches contained in the collection *Der Torso*, the most subtle and artistic by far is *Untergetaucht*. It is remarkable both for its content and form; in a moment of enthusiasm one is tempted to say that it represents as distinguished an achievement as the literature of the genre can show. Within the compass of four and a half pages we get an epitome of existence in the Third Reich, reflected through the most vital problem which faced the private citizen: his attitude to the "enemies of the realm." Equally remarkable is the way the story is told; its technique is a piece of virtuosity among a collection of notably virtuoso tales.

Elisabeth Langgässer herself has said that the stories in *Der Torso* reveal "aspects of man, whose ruined and soulless image is placed under the judgment of God." The formula fits our story only partially.

⁵ G. Ehrismann: *Die Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (im Handbuch des deutschen Unterrichts) (Munich, 1922), II (i), 86.

The principal character, a Berlin housewife, is not a ruined soul. On the contrary, she is a heroine who risks her freedom and possibly her life to do a decent, humane act: that of harboring a Jewess in her home. But there are ruined and partially ruined souls in the picture of life which the story presents. The total effect is deeper and artistically more satisfying than that which the author would have achieved if she had adhered to her formula.

The fable is simple. A group of good "Aryan" women have agreed among themselves to harbor a Jewess, a former schoolmate, who is fleeing from the Gestapo. She is to circulate among them, spending a night in each home. But as usually happens in such cases, the first person gets stuck with the visitor. She remains in the first home until the Gestapo come to take her away, having been tipped off by someone as to her whereabouts.

Around this simple plot Elisabeth Langgässer has woven a dense tapestry of detail revealing character, social background and the ethical problems raised for Germans living under Hitler. And she has done all this so artistically, with such a light and casual touch, that on first reading, the story seems like the flimsiest of anecdotes. Only careful study reveals the many treasures it harbors.

There are five principal characters: a nondescript couple, whose home is the scene of the events described; the Jewess Elsi Goldmann; Frau Geheinke, wife of a block warden; and the parrot Jacob who belongs to the couple. Each of these represents one specimen in the social gallery of human types and is the bearer of an ethical attitude toward the problem which forms the core of the story.

The general milieu is sketched with deft strokes, adding up to a telling picture. The unwilling hosts of the fugitive Jewess are a couple belonging to the caste of petty officialdom. Karl, the husband, is an *Oberpostsekretär*,—one has but a faint adumbration of what this dignity may signify. He has a wooden leg, possibly a relic from World War I. We learn that he has only recently joined the Party, a hint that he was not a Nazi by conviction, but joined in order to keep his job. If he were a convinced Nazi, moreover, he would scarcely have tolerated the presence of the Jewess in his home even for the first night. We learn something about his wife Frieda too. She is a stately woman, stout, with black hair, rather Semitic in appearance. As she sits in the beer parlor of the suburban railway station with the companion to whom she tells her story, the two women drink in no ladylike sips but in vigorous draughts. "Ich muß sagen" comments the narrator of the story admiringly, "sie tranken nicht schlecht."

She still wears corsets and has to be unlaced by her husband. There are no children in the home but there is a parrot, at first Jacob, now the green Lora. We catch a glimpse of a garden in the suburban house. The whole picture points to a humble white-collar milieu of conventional respectability, nowhere near the level of our suburbanites, but rather representative of "the people."

* * *

There is an element of mystery in our story; and this "whodunit" aspect is left tantalizingly unsolved. It is never made clear who it was that denounced the Jewess to the Gestapo. Was it Karl or Frau Geheinke, the block warden's wife? Frieda refers to her husband several times as that "seelenguter Mensch." She certainly does not seem to suspect him. Why doesn't she identify the culprit or even discuss the denunciation? There are a number of hints in the story which shed light on this question. Frieda tells her companion that on the very day the Gestapo agent called for the Jewess, the husband said that they could keep her no longer. Secondly, the fact that the Gestapo man knew that the fugitive's name was Goldmann, points to the husband as the informer. The block warden's wife would not know this. Indeed the block warden's wife could not have suspected that the visitor was a Jewess, since Elsi didn't look Jewish. Frau Geheinke would not even have known that there was anything irregular in the situation if the hostess had not lied to her that the woman was her cousin; unfortunately Frau Geheinke had seen the cousin on a previous occasion. There is a third factor which speaks for Karl as the informer. His wife relates that the consequences of the crime were not serious for her; she got off with several interrogations by the Gestapo. This is only understandable if we assume that the good Karl secured this light treatment for her (and for himself) by his patriotic deed in turning the Jewess over to the authorities. He probably pleaded leniency for his "weak, foolish" wife who had absorbed romantic notions of school loyalty instead of the nobler loyalty to the Führer.

But the most damning bit of evidence against the husband occurs in the very last sentence of the story. The unidentified listener who later writes the story and here acts as a sort of Greek chorus, interrupts the two women to ask Frieda: "Who is going to clear your husband before the denazification courts?" In asking the question he commits a Freudian slip; instead of saying "Wo ist jetzt noch jemand, der Ihren Mann vor der Spruchkammer entlastet?" he says *entlaust*. In

this context the word carries a twofold connotation. It indicates that the man is lousy—i. e. a “stinker”; but it also connects him with “lousy Jacob,” the parrot who is another of the principal characters in our story.

The parrot is, in one sense, the “falcon” in our story. He symbolizes the sheer malevolence of nazism. One can find “excuses” for the conduct of the husband and the block warden’s wife, who may be said to be acting out of necessity or a mistaken sense of duty. Ernst von Salomon, in his *Fragebogen*, has “explained” and more or less justified the state of mind of Gestapo officials on the basis of such a misconception of duty, in contrast to the wilful brutality of American soldiers who were denazifying Germany. To this latter category our ignoble falcon must be reckoned. His conduct toward the Jewess, who has been caring for him, bears the stamp of unmitigated evil. He shares with humans the gift of speech, man’s noblest attainment. But he uses language without reason—to babble what others say before him rather than to think for himself; and he uses it to betray those who have shown him kindness. His eagerness to hurt the Jewess is not even grounded in ideology. It is his nature to bite the hand that feeds him and he tries it again with the Russian soldier.

That Elisabeth Langgässer conceived of the parrot as a symbol for depraved humanity becomes clear from the study of her imagery made by Bernhard Blume in a paper on *Das unauslöschliche Siegel (Kreatur und Element. Zur Metaphysik von Elisabeth Langgässers Roman “Das unauslöschliche Siegel,” Euphorion 48 [1954] 71-89)*. Professor Blume’s study also throws some light on the title of our story. The image of submerged living is a recurrent and basic one in our author’s work. But while it normally indicates an existence without grace, from which man may be redeemed by clean water from heaven, in the topsy-turvy world of the Third Reich, the submerged were the ones who really lived in grace, whereas those who were on top were corrupted by the foul air of nazism.

* * *

In this brief sketch Elisabeth Langgässer has also succeeded in depicting with masterly skill the psychology of fear as it grips the victims of a terror State. From the moment when the block warden’s wife begins to suspect that there is something wrong, a change occurs in the atmosphere of the little household. The tension under which the three people live raises pockets of hatred, especially in the two women who are constantly together. Even elementary sense perception be-

comes distorted. The "nordic" looking Jewess suddenly develops Semitic features for her frightened and irritated hostess. And Elsi herself begins to see her Semitic features when she looks at herself in the mirror. Not only her nerve and sense of judgment suffer; her very motor development is impaired. She spills her food and stutters. She becomes spiteful and cruel to her hostess who (however unwillingly) is saving her from the concentration camp.

But at the moment of great danger, when the Gestapo agent is at the door, the Jewess regains her humanity and saves the situation by her mental alertness. She tells the Gestapo man that she had just entered the house from the back, thinking it was unoccupied—a rather unconvincing "explanation." But more important still, she has the presence of mind to throw a cloth over lousy Jacob's cage, to prevent him from babbling her name.

* * *

An important ingredient in the story is the heroine's state of mind. Although she has ample justification for feeling heroic because she has harbored a Jewess at great risk to herself, any such feeling of self-righteousness is wholly alien to her. Throughout the story she plays down her own role in this drama. She does not feel superior to the other women who had agreed to shelter the Jewess but had not abided by their promise. It just happened, she explains, that she was first on the list and so was stuck. She disavows any special courage in taking the fugitive in. There she stood at the front door on a wretched sleety night. What else was there to do? The fixed impression she has carried away from the whole nightmarish episode is admiration for Elsie's decency during the dénouement rather than pride at her own heroism. When the Gestapo agent came Elsi might have saved her own neck by pointing to the stout, black-haired nordic as the Jewess. It is difficult to say whether she really believes that such a silly stratagem might have helped. But at any rate this is the myth she has built up out of the historical events. Her permanent feeling is one of admiration for Elsi, not for herself.

* * *

The strong ethical note which permeates all of Elisabeth Langgässer's work is sensible throughout this story, but expresses itself especially in the fate of the two main malefactors: the evil parrot and Karl the host. With the Jewess out of the way, lousy Jacob transfers his malignant patriotic fervor to the invading Russians. The fact that the particular Russian with whom he associates is again a benefactor

makes no more impression on him than it did in the case of the Jewess. Jacob must bite; so the Russian cuts his throat. As for the husband, we gather from the closing remark of the narrator that he will have to appear before the denazification court and will be hard put to it to find someone willing to "delouse" him.

* * *

The predominant tone of the story is irony. The implication held by the title is certainly ironical; so is the fact that one of the principal characters is an animal. But the sharpest focus of the author's irony is directed at the Nazi racial nonsense, which is exposed very deftly. The hunted Jewess is slim and attractive in build, has light brown hair and a straight nose and even bears the typical Aryan name of Elsi, while her one hundred percent Aryan hostess looks Semitic. And the simon pure patriotic parrot is named Jacob, as that other model of Aryan manhood, Goebbels, was named Joseph and the philosopher of nordic racialism was named Rosenberg.

* * *

The structure of the story indicates that the author was greatly concerned to obtain distance. The narration takes place in the post war period after the collapse of the Third Reich. Whatever emotions the events may have stirred originally are now recollected in tranquility. Even more distance is achieved by the device of a casual eavesdropper: a laborer waiting in the bar of the railway station in which the two women sit talking. In this way the woman's account is filtered through the mind and sensibility of a chance bystander, an average man, who is even less emotionally involved in the events than the heroine. This effort to obtain distance is related to the author's artistic concern to play down the heroism of the heroine. She begins her narrative on a note of apology: "I was only human after all." The writer adds that she repeated this sentence over and over. The phrase accentuates her sense of guilt at not having done something more positive to save the Jewess. She must realize that anything more active would have entailed martyrdom for herself; but that is her state of mind.

I think that Elisabeth Langgässer wished to suggest that this non-descript German housewife is a representative, typical character rather than an individual. And this applies to the others as well; they remain half anonymous: Karl and Frieda, Hilde, Trude, Erika. Only two of them have surnames: the Jewess Elsi Goldmann and the block warden's wife, Frau Geheinke. The name Goldmann had to be

mentioned for purposes of irony: this is the only thing Jewish about the hunted fugitive. And the delicious name Geheinke tells us all we need to know about that type.

What Elisabeth Langgässer is saying, then, is that the problem of the German attitude to national socialism is not one that can be reduced to a formula. There is no more a collective German guilt than there is a collective German innocence. There were all shades of responsibility, from dastardly crime to noble humanity, from anonymous and unself-conscious heroism to spiteful brutality. Such a testimonial from Elisabeth Langgässer has significance; for both she and her oldest daughter suffered brutally at the hands of the regime.

Antioch College

HARRY STEINHAUER

REVIEWS

Gerard Murphy, ed. and trans., *Early Irish Lyrics: Eighth to Twelfth Century* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1956. xxii + 315 pp. \$6.75).

EARLY Irish Lyrics is another major contribution to Celtic scholarship, worthy to rank with Professor Murphy's recently completed edition of *Duanaire Finn*. Within this compact and attractive volume the editor has brought together and translated fifty-eight lyrics of exceptional literary quality.

Much Early Irish literature has now been published and translated but has tended to lie hidden in inaccessible journals. By making a vital body of poetry available in the original and in translation Professor Murphy has performed for specialist and general reader alike a most important service which few could have undertaken with equal competence.

He has provided an illuminating introduction on the development of Irish poetry and an informed account of the editor's problems in interpreting the manuscript tradition. He has restudied the available manuscripts, has normalized and emended brilliantly, and has provided scrupulous textual, linguistic, and prosodic notes. For the non-specialist he might have given a short summary of Irish prosody, but fortunately a clear treatment of this intricate subject has just been

made once more available through the republication of Miss Eleanor Knott's *Irish Syllabic Poetry* (Dublin, 1957). He has also given an extensive literary and bibliographical commentary on each of the poems. Celticists will be delighted to find that he has dated all the poems as closely as possible on linguistic grounds—a difficult art in which he has developed an acknowledged mastery—and that he has added a glossary, which is both convenient and necessary because of the wearisome delay in the completion of the Royal Irish Academy's dictionary.

The choice and range of the selections seem admirable, including as they do monastic nature poems, prayers, and hymns, and secular love lyrics, otherworld descriptions, and narrative poems connected with Mad Sweeney and with Finn MacCoul. The legend of Cuchulainn is represented by the graceful *Description of Mag Mell* rather than from the *Cattle Raid of Cooley*, and appropriately so, since the latter, though famous, excels more in its prose passages than in its verse.

The translations, which are in prose, are deliberately precise and conscientious. Professor Murphy's purpose is to provide a scholarly opinion as to the meaning of the original and also to indicate what is still unclear. During the period of rediscovery of native Irish poetry, errors in scholarship have contributed some fine phrases to English translations, as the editor of the *Irish Statesman* once wittily pointed out (9 Jan., 1926). Likewise, deliberate misrepresentation of the source has produced some admirable and widely anthologized verse, such as Rolleston's *Dead at Clonmacnois*. But at the present stage of Celtic studies, our primary need is for accuracy rather than airy grace.

One example will suffice. Working from an earlier and inadequate edition of the *Lament of the Old Woman of Beare*, Frank O'Connor offers the following stanzas in his *Fountain of Magic* (London, 1939):

'Tis not age that makes my pain
But the eye that sees so plain
How when all it loves decays,
Femon's ways are gold again.

Femon, Bregon, sacring stone,
Sacring stone and Ronan's throne,
Storms have sacked so long that now
Tomb and sacring stone are one.

In Professor Murphy's prose translation, the corresponding stanzas, with the footnotes here included in brackets, read:

I envy no one old, excepting only Feimen [a plain in Co. Tipperary]; as for

me, I have worn an old person's garb; Feimen's crop [*barr* means both 'crop' and 'hair'] is still yellow.

The Stone of the Kings in Feimen, Rónan's Dwelling in Bregun, it is long since storms (first) reached their cheeks; but they are not old and withered.

Beside these two versions we may set the original; and even those who do not understand it may sense that a painstaking scholar is really the best guide to the verbal subtleties and allusions of a poem written more than eleven centuries ago:

Ním-gaib format fri nach sen
inge nammá fri Feimen:
meisse, ro miult forbuid sin;
buide beus barr Feimin.

Lia na Ríg hi Femun,
Caithir Rónáin hi mBregun,
cían ó ro-síachtar sína
a lleicne; nít senchrína.

As for minor details, note 1 on p. 31 might add that 9c is translated in the R. I. A. Contrib., s. v. *indládad*, "without ribaldry, without boasting (?)." In stanza 4 on p. 118, for *ú* read *tú*. P. 135 st. 57, *forty-pronged antlers* would be clearer than *forty antlers*. P. 136 st. 64: for the sake of meter read *ainglide* instead of *bithainglide*, following R. P. Lehmann, who attributes the latter to dittography, in an article, EC, VI, 301, which appeared too late for reference. P. 145 st. 17, for *fifty* read *twenty*. P. 174 line 18, for *and g-d* read *and g-h*. P. 200, last line of # 26, for *b and c* read *b and d*. P. 265, col. 2, line 3, for *p. 170* read *p. 176*.

P. 108 st. 8, *tri bile do chorcorglain*, "three trees of red glass" seems an unlikely translation, though generally accepted; T. P. Cross, *Motif-Index of Early Irish Lit.*, Bloomington, 1952, provides a special motif number F811.1.6* for *Glass tree in otherworld*, but he has only three references, and they are all to this line. Perhaps the more obvious translation might here be the correct one, "three trees of pure red (color)," in reference presumably to the rowan with its magic associations (cf. Cross, F811.3.1 *Purple tree*; D950.6 *Magic . . . rowan*, and cross-references). Parallel constructions, such as *do mid medrach*, occur in the poem; and the expression *brat . . . corcarghlan* "pure red cloak" occurs in IT, I, 119 line 15.

These trivial points, however, pale into insignificance when set beside the wealth of learning which went into the making of this excellent volume.

New York University

CHARLES W. DUNN

W. Todd Furniss, William G. Madsen and Richard B. Young, *Three Studies in the Renaissance: Sidney, Jonson, Milton* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1958. vii + 283 pp. Yale Studies in English, 138. \$6.00). THIS latest volume in the Yale Studies in English consists of three recent doctoral dissertations, somewhat revised and abbreviated, all prepared under the direction of Professor Louis Martz. They are competent studies which reflect well upon the graduate school which produced them, but the reader is too often aware of their particular academic origins.

Richard B. Young's *English Petrarke: A Study of Sidney's Astrophel and Stella* is a systematic study of Sidney's sonnet sequence which seeks to determine the relation of form and content in poetry. This is a large and difficult subject, but for his purposes Young limits it largely to the relation between "*Astrophel the *dramatis persona*, and Sidney, in *propria persona*" (p. 18). He asks how Sidney is able to use the highly formalized and conventional attitudes and responses of the Petrarchan love tradition to express emotions distinctly his own. Sidney does this, the author holds, by causing Astrophel to play various roles as the sequence progresses. The technique is dramatic, with Astrophel as Sidney analyzing and commenting upon the Petrarchan conventions which Astrophel the lover expresses. Sidney's achievement "is not only in the excellence of the individual sonnets but in the arrangement of the sequence to exploit the different modes of the convention in such a way that the generalized forms acquire specific significance in a single poetic structure" (p. 88).*

Young's work is laborious reading, but it does demonstrate the structural unity of *Astrophel and Stella*, and it is often perceptive in indicating the relation of poem to poem. The reader shudders at a sentence like "There is a simultaneous expansion and contraction, as Astrophel moves from an isolated and detached position through successive stages of involvement in the moral and social world, an involvement which at the same time forces him deeper into introspective activity, into a new and more meaningful isolation" (p. 41). But when he has gone back and read it for the third time, he recognizes that Young has something to say about the structure of *Astrophel and Stella* in spite of the impossible jargon in which his ideas are couched.

Ben Jonson's Masques by W. Todd Furniss is a far more readable study which makes a significant contribution in an important field. It is simply and clearly organized, well written, and free from the naive pedantry so characteristic of doctoral dissertations. Following

the lead of A. H. Gilbert, E. W. Talbert and D. J. Gordon, Furniss argues that the masque was dominated by the king before whom it was performed, that it evolved as a lavish flattery of the king designed to praise him in the manner of the medieval *Laudes Regiae* and to offer him moral instruction in the tradition of *De Regimine Principe* literature. Furniss demonstrates that these purposes shape Jonson's masques into coherent artistic unities, and that the one masque not designed for performance before the king, *Lovers Made Men*, fails to reach the excellence of the others because of the very absence of the royal audience. "Without the king," he concludes, "the masque is next to nothing" (p. 175).

Furniss divides Jonson's masques into four large groups, the Golden Age, the Pastoral, the Triumph, and the Combat of Concepts. He says something—would that space had permitted him to say more—of Jonson's antecedents in each of these categories, relating the Golden Age masques to Arthurian legend, the Pastoral masques to fertility rites, the Triumphs to the Roman triumphal pageants, and the Combat of Concepts masques to the medieval debate poems. He treats only representative masques from each group, and in each that he discusses he is able to show how the central symbol shifts from the stage character to the watching king. In the Golden Age masques the king becomes "a divine symbol of the heavenly hierarchy . . . a new Saturn, the restorer of the Golden Age" (p. 124). In the Pastoral masques the king is the source of fertility. In the Triumphs the tribute to the king is reinforced by elaborate spectacle of the magnificence of his reign. Even Jonson's display of learning is related to this purpose, for this "served rather as a means of presenting a worthy theme to a worthy audience, a means of finding the appropriate voice and sense for an address to the king."

The Combat of Concepts masques were concerned with questions relating to the king himself, his rights and responsibilities. It is regrettable that space did not permit Furniss to develop this portion of his study in greater detail, for new light might have been thrown upon Jonson's own political ideas and perhaps upon their relation to the historical interests he displayed in *Sejanus* and *Catiline*.

William G. Madsen's *The Idea of Nature in Milton's Poetry* is a useful demonstration of the Christian orthodoxy of Milton's view of nature in *Comus* and *Paradise Lost*. It denies the many claims which have been made for Milton's Neo-Platonism and holds that he is closer in his belief to Aquinas than to Plato. The point is well taken, and we would not really expect Madsen's conclusions to be otherwise.

The larger and more complex question of the relation of Christian humanism to Neo-Platonism remains unsettled, although Madsen makes an important statement when he says that "Milton's idea of nature as an ethical norm does not so much repudiate the central classical tradition of Plato, Aristotle and Cicero as extend and qualify it in the light of the Christian conception of the nature and destiny of man" (p. 275).

The study betrays its dissertation origins by much wasteful polemic and by the rehearsal of much which has become commonplace to historians of ideas. Do Renaissance students need again to be told of the Christian humanist view of an ordered purposive nature, controlled by and emanating from the mind of God, as opposed to the libertine and lawless nature of the skeptics? Madsen has read widely in his subject, but surprisingly he fails to cite one of the best treatments of it in recent years, J. F. Danby's *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature*. Madsen argues closely and cogently, and a clear view of much Miltonic doctrine emerges from his study. I cannot see, however, that he relates this doctrine to Milton's achievement as a poet so closely as he claims to do.

Tulane University

IRVING RIBNER

Wolfgang Clemen, *Kommentar zu Shakespeares Richard III: Interpretation eines Dramas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957. 356 pp.). THE work of Wolfgang Clemen, along with that of students in his seminar at Munich, is an impressive testimonial to the revival of Shakespearean scholarship in Germany today. He is most widely known for his *Shakespeares Bilder*, especially through the somewhat modified version rendered by him into English a few years ago, perhaps the sanest and best-rounded among the many studies of Shakespeare's imagery. But English and American students have yet to assimilate and recognize the importance of his subsequent contributions in German: notably, an interesting study of messengers and their speeches, published by the Bavarian Academy in 1952; a richly suggestive monograph approaching the pre-Shakespearean drama from the same vantage-point, *Die Tragödie vor Shakespeare: Ihre Entwicklung im Spiegel der dramatischen Rede* (Heidelberg, 1955); and an article on Clarence's dream and murder, anticipating this full-scale *Kommentar* which has just been laid before us. Viewing these

works in sequence, we can now see that their author, while making comprehensive use of recent and relevant findings, has been formulating a method of his own. Since it is one which stresses the more formal and traditional aspects of Shakespeare's dramaturgy, as well as his indebtedness to his immediate predecessors, Professor Clemen could not have chosen a single play better suited to his purposes. For *Richard III* is not merely the longest of the histories, and of all the plays excepting *Hamlet*; it is the most elaborately contrived of the works written before Shakespeare's lyrical period. Its very contrivance marks that stage in his development when he had mastered the inherited forms and the basic idioms of his craft, but was not yet radically engaged in transforming them. Seneca is still a conditioning factor, and so is the pseudo-Machiavelli. Echoes of earlier conventions and of recurrent *topoi*, which have cried out for a commentator, have found an apt one in Professor Clemen.

The text to which he refers the reader is Peter Alexander's, supplemented by variant readings from Dover Wilson's edition and by some from other modern editors. The emphasis is not primarily textual, nor stylistic to any degree of detail. A commentary in a foreign language is not the same thing as an explication; it is the rhetorical structure, rather than the poetic texture, to which Professor Clemen redirects our close attention. Proceeding scene-by-scene, if not line-by-line, his paragraphic comments are pithy *excursus* which return well-informed to the passage at hand. The adaptation of sources is adequately summed up after the treatment of each scene, though More and Holinshed are less strategic to this approach than such dramatic precedents as the Vice. The intellectual background is duly sketched in; for example, the relationship between Richard's deformity and his malignity is documented from both Bacon and Freud; and yet the characterization can best be explained, as it is by the discussion of the wooing scenes, in theatrical rather than in psychological terms. Professor Clemen does not take advantage of the highly colorful stage-history of this play, as it has been attested from Burbage to Olivier. However, by taking the individual speech as a unit of construction, he shows that the genre of chronicle-history need not be considered loose or episodic. *Richard III* is constructed around a momentous series of set-pieces: choric and didactic, the laments of Anne and the curses of Margaret, Clarence's dream and Buckingham's farewell. Above all, its protagonist holds forth in continual monologue; as a hypocritical villain, he must express his true self in soliloquies and asides; thus the irony is made quite explicit through the running contrast between

schein and *sein*. But Richard is finally counterbalanced by Richmond; and the simultaneous pageant between them at Bosworth Field, with its two tents, its rival orations, and its procession of ghosts, is our clearest instance of what Professor Clemen would term "the principle of symmetry" in Shakespeare's early craftsmanship.

Harvard University

HARRY LEVIN

Dale Underwood, *Etherege and the Seventeenth-Century Comedy of Manners* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press; London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1957. ix + 165 pp. Yale Studies in English, 135. \$4.00). Kaspar Spinner, *George Farquhar als Dramatiker* (Bern: Francke, 1957. 119 pp. Swiss Studies in English, 40). REJECTING the earlier approaches to Restoration comedy in which emphasis was placed on immorality, on social mode or manners, or on wit, Mr. Underwood adopts a new point of view, that of *values*. "The society of Restoration comedy of manners may be viewed as in large part the product of two broadly opposing sets of traditions: on the one hand Christianity and Christian humanism, the 'heroic' tradition, the honest-man tradition of courtly love; on the other, philosophical and moral libertinism, Machiavellian and Hobbesian concepts as to the nature of man, and Machiavellian ethics." He divides his study into three sections: a picture of the "fertile ground" of libertinism, an examination of *Etherege's* three plays, and a survey of *Etherege's* antecedents in comedy from Lyly to Killegrew. What, incidentally, prompts him to take up the dramatic forerunners *after* his examination of *Etherege* is never made clear.

The study of fertile ground understandably emphasizes the libertine over the Christian tradition since the former is in many ways more significant for *Etherege's* character and since it is less familiar. Underwood sketches the possible influences of Epicureanism, Cynicism, and the various forms of skepticism, both classical and Christian. Turning to the individual comedies, he attempts to show these antithetic worlds in conflict. In *The Comical Revenge*, a mixed play with a considerable Jacobean remnant, the traditional world of the heroic-romantic couples gets scanty attention as he devotes most of his time to Sir Frederick, the libertine whose "fall from grace" into honorable marriage is shown to be ironically a fall into grace in the orthodox

sense. The subplot involving Sir Nicholas, though Jacobean, also provides parallelism and opposition to the Frederick-Widow plot inasmuch as Sir Nicholas is a pretender to wit and libertinism. In *She Would If She Could* Etherege is shown as having shaken off the influences of the earlier period and moved into the Restoration mode. Here the contrasting worlds are more sharply in opposition: the young wits and, less fully, the girls represent a world of easy libertinism; the Cockwoods, no better morally than the libertines, are both hypocrites and mock wits. Underwood stresses the "polarity" of these comic worlds and the scenes in which they are displayed. So far there has been less novelty of approach than one might have expected. The attack on *The Man of Mode* is another matter. Retaining a geometric figure Underwood interprets Etherege's masterpiece as presenting "a special problem in the Restoration comedy of manners and an exception to its general practice." Now a sub-group—young Bellair, Emilia, Lady Townley—represent the "true perpendicular" in moral attitude and conduct; both the Dorimant-Harriet group and the various gulls fall off into the oblique. Or, to abandon the metaphor, Dorimant no longer represents the simple hedonism of Sir Frederick and Courtall but shows clearly what was only implied and secondary before: a maliciousness, a thirst for power, an egoism such as Hobbes had imputed to man. The remaining chapter of Part II is devoted to the language of Etherege's comedies: the "new or more extended signification" of both the metaphoric and the non-metaphoric language, the imagery, and the wit. Part III gives relatively brief attention to the conflict between libertine and orthodox views, especially in love plots, in comedies by Lyly, Shakespeare, Jonson, Fletcher, Shirley, and a few lesser figures. Though there are libertine elements present, these do not have the weight they will have after 1660 since the authors remain persistently on the side of conventional morality.

Any judgment on Mr. Underwood's book must necessarily be mixed. The analysis of values is often penetrating. The study of inversions, for example, in which the libertine code is shown as the obverse of orthodoxy, though often employing the same language and imagery; the analysis of the war between the sexes; the careful weighing of subtle nuances in *art* and *nature*—these are quite admirable. The section on language is also perceptive, so much so that one wishes he had devoted more space to such things as the analysis of wit. The exposition of complex ironies and ambiguities in Lady Cockwood's

"Peace, he may yet redeem his honour!" is but one of many possible examples of the author at his best.

In some respects, however, Mr. Underwood's study is rather less satisfactory. There is no attempt, for one thing, to show precisely how the elaborate picture of libertine background is to be connected with Etherege. As Fujimura has adequately shown, the dramatist had little interest in theoretical ethics. Even more unsatisfactory are some features of the analysis of the plays. The treatment of the first two is least objectionable; that of *She Would If She Could* is often acute. But when he turns to Etherege's best play, *The Man of Mode*, his judgment falters. Ignoring both the author's obvious intentions and the traditional acceptance of the piece, he sets out to establish Dorimant as the "comic villain," a villain whose actions are marked by "a Hobbesian aggressiveness, competitiveness, and drive for power and 'glory'; a Machiavellian dissembling and cunning; a satanic pride, vanity, and malice; and, drawing upon each of these frames of meaning, an egoistic assertion of self through the control of others." Substantiation of this sweeping charge requires what is at times the most patent over-reading or even the misuse of evidence. Two illustrations must suffice. Dorimant's casual remarks about Emilia's unassailable virtue, remarks which in their context seem hardly very serious, are raised to the level of deep-dyed plot. His comment to Medley about her being a discreet maid becomes a "grudging admission." The other illustration has to do with Dorimant's several dupes and fools. While the appraisal of Loveit's position and character is on the whole unexceptionable, Underwood dismisses Belinda and Sir Fopling too easily—to add a deeper tinge to Dorimant's villainy. The fop is made to appear little more than a "naturally good-humored fool." Belinda escapes all blame for her forcing Dorimant to break with Loveit so cruelly in the fan-tearing scene.

Mr. Underwood's prose style is not especially felicitous. Considering his critical objectives and method, one expects a certain amount of abstractness. So much elaboration and refinement of abstraction, however, seems hard to justify. The following sentence is perhaps too extreme to stand as typical but it does indicate something of the writer's—and the reader's—difficulty: "The comedy of love, of nature and art, of wit, passion and control is everywhere conditioned by this comedy of manners." Even this congeries of categories does not, it may be added, exhaust Mr. Underwood's list. A less obtrusive problem in diction is the lack of preciseness and consistency in the use of a few key words, such as *nature*, *art*, *hero*, *honest man*. His diligence in

preparing his text is, on the other hand, highly commendable. Few errors, none really damaging, have crept into the text. At one point, p. 11, *Fournel* is given as *Fourmel*; on p. 45 the publisher of the Brett-Smith *Etherege* is given as Oxford University Press rather than Blackwell; on p. 91 *Loveit* becomes *Lovett*.

The Swiss scholar's book on Farquhar can be disposed of more briefly, for it is less ambitious and considerably less meritorious. Basing his own study principally on the works of Schmid, Stonehill, Connely, and Strauss, Mr. Spinner makes no attempt to add to or correct the scholarship on Farquhar. His only claim to novelty rests upon his examination of the plays themselves, under the headings of characterization, plotting, comic conflict, sentimentalism, and language. There is a brief treatment of sources plus a much fuller comparison of *The Inconstant* with Fletcher's *Wild Goose Chase*. There is also a chapter on Farquhar's *Discourse upon Comedy* which does little more than summarize the arguments. None of this really provides the student of Restoration drama any especially useful insights. For example, his grouping of the principals under four headings (*der jugendlich-wilde Liebhaber, das tugendhaft liebende Mädchen, der ehrenhaft-nüchterne Liebhaber, die unabhängige, weltliche Frau*) may serve as an interesting exercise in classification. Since, however, it results in such dubious pairings as Lady Lurewell with Mrs. Sullen and since it omits, somewhat unaccountably, as important a figure as Dorinda, its usefulness is debatable.

Mr. Spinner also falls well below the level set by the American study in care and accuracy in preparing the text. This reviewer noted over two dozen errors in detail, ranging from minor slips such as *der* for *her*, *Sück* for *Stück* to much grosser ones such as giving Vanbrugh's first name as George, omitting a speech from a quotation of dialogue, scrambling the speakers in a passage of dialogue (twice), and assigning Congreve's *Old Bachelor* to Wycherley.

University of Texas

LEO HUGHES

Edward A. Bloom, *Samuel Johnson in Grub Street* (Providence, Rhode Island: Brown Univ. Press, 1957. xii + 309 pp. Brown University Studies, 21. \$6.00). JOHNSON was among other things—perhaps before most other things—a great professional journalist, and an accurate and perceptive study of his journalistic in-

volvements has long been needed. Regrettably, Mr. Bloom's book does not fill this need. The misleading title is ominous: does Mr. Bloom really think that "Grub Street" is a synonym for journalism? It means hack-writing in general. Moreover, the contempt implied in the term is something that in my opinion (though it is not clear that this is Mr. Bloom's) Johnson's journalistic work does not deserve.

Much of the book consists of summary and quotation of pieces of journalistic writing by Johnson. (By the way, when Johnson remarked to Wilkes that quotation "is a good thing: there is a community of mind in it"—Mr. Bloom quotes this in his own defence—he was *not* talking about the use of excerpts in scholarly monographs.) Of the remainder, little is based on original investigation: it is largely a compilation from earlier work by others, some of it outdated and inaccurate. The seventh chapter, for instance, "Johnson on a Free Press," is vitiated by its reliance on the discredited nineteenth-century reading of the political history of the time: to talk of "George III's attempted abuses of human rights" (243) is to ignore the last thirty years of historical scholarship. At one point (178-83) Mr. Bloom's uncritical acceptance of "authority" leads him into absurdity: he treats two different pieces based on the Duchess of Marlborough's memoirs, written from diametrically opposite points of view, as though they were a single essay by Johnson, and is forced to explain away the resulting contradictions by talking about Johnson's "ambivalence" and "irony." All this stems from an error in Nichol Smith's *CHEL* bibliography, 1913, repeated in Courtney: no one earlier, so far as I know, ever suggested that the second piece was Johnson's; the nineteenth-century editions of the *Works* correctly print only the earlier essay.¹

The part of the book that might have been most useful to the student is the listing ("Appendix B") of "The Journalistic Canon." As it is, it cannot be relied on. The principles on which Mr. Bloom constructs it are not clear. His has undue reverence for the name of Boswell: "The most authoritative opinion, of course, is Boswell's," he says, p. 121. Boswell's *opinion* as to Johnson's authorship of a piece, when unsupported by argument, is no more authoritative than that of any other reasonably intelligent student of Johnson. The fact is that in most cases Boswell is merely transmitting titles of pieces that others had earlier ascribed to Johnson, and the provenance

¹ This matter has been ably set right by Jacob Leed (*N & O*, May, 1957, 210).

of each one needs to be scrutinized closely. For instance, the "Foreign History" in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for November, 1748, appears in the "Chronological Catalogue" of Johnson's prose in Boswell's *Life* (ed. Hill-Powell), with no explanation except the note "*intern. evid.*" A glance at the piece reveals no such internal evidence, and further inquiry shows that the entry first appeared in the third edition of the *Life*, 1799, so that it is not even necessarily Boswell's. It is almost certainly a mistake for "Foreign History," November, 1747, which had been plausibly attributed to Johnson in the *GM* for 1794. But it continues to be piously handed down. Yet Boswell's "authority" is not always thus deferred to: Mr. Bloom does not even mention one of his most interesting attributions, "The Jests of Hierocles." Hill said categorically, "This piece is certainly not by Johnson," and that is enough to consign it to oblivion, Boswell or no Boswell. (I think Hill was wrong, as he not infrequently was, and Boswell right.) If "authority" is to play a role in the establishment of a canon, it should be handled with more consistency than this.

Some miscellaneous corrections. P. 23: "A member of the French Academy, Morin. . . ." He was a member of the *Académie des Sciences*, a very different thing. It was to the *Académie des Sciences* that Fontenelle, its secretary, delivered the *éloge* that Johnson translated. P. 77: "In 1763, Guthrie published his first book, a *Complete List of the English Peerage*." His *History of England* was published 1744-51. P. 115: "A trinitarian, . . . Johnson could not but be offended by the unitarianism which the Presbyterians espoused." Presbyterians will be startled by this account of their theology. Pp. 120-1: "Hawkins . . . first assigned to Johnson all the pieces in the *Universal Visiter* subscribed with two asterisks." They were first assigned in the *European Magazine*, February, 1785, p. 82. Moreover, the statement is a misreading of Hawkins: see *Poems of Samuel Johnson*, ed. Smith-McAdam, 1941, p. 399. P. 251: "Chalmers recommended their consideration to Walesby." This statement is documented by reference to an article of mine, but I say no such thing. Pp. 259, 264: "An *Advertisement to the Re-publication of the Spectator* . . . was reprinted . . . from an unknown source." Nichol Smith, *CBEL*, 1941, gives the source—*Public Advertiser*, 14 December 1776. P. 265: "'An Essay on Epitaphs,' [*GM*] X (Nov., 1740), 593-6." "'Epigrams from the *Greek Anthology*,' X (Dec., 1740), 595." Page 595 falls of course between pages 593 and 596: for "Dec." read "Nov." The two entries concern the same item in the *GM*. P. 275: "John Croker . . . claimed Elizabeth Carter corresponded

with Barretier." A full account of their correspondence is given in Montague Pennington's *Memoirs of Miss Carter*, London, 1808, I, 70-94. P. 284: "An error has been perpetuated . . . by the identification of the piece as *Memoirs of Frederick III, King of Prussia*. Johnson's subject was Frederick II." This is not an error. Frederick the Great was regularly known in eighteenth-century England as Frederick III—see, e.g., Smollett's *History*. Presumably his father, now called Frederick William I, was regarded as the second Frederick. The British Museum catalogue carries a cross-reference from Frederick III to Frederick II. P. 286: "a review of *An Authentic Account of the Present State of Lisbon*. . . ." Bloom follows Hill and Powell in misdescribing this as a review, and Hill, Powell, and Courtney in referring to a ghost book entitled *An Authentic Account*, &c. The piece is exactly what it says it is, an account of Lisbon extracted from a pamphlet entitled *A Satirical Review*, &c. I pointed this out in an article which Bloom cites elsewhere in his book.

Mr. Bloom treats the English language in a fashion unexpected in a student of Johnson. He writes in a sort of pseudo-learned jargon in which he coins words, mixes metaphors, and mangles idiom. For example: "both authors were compatible in moral attitudes" (23); "the regular traffic of East India Company ships . . . piqued curiosity for information about the East" (27); "Consistent with Johnson's political attitudes in *London* and later writings, *To Posterity* is earnest and recriminating in tone, reflective of his lifelong contempt for oppressors, and an early actualization of a rebellious spirit that is at odds with the patina of conservatism" (44); "*To Posterity* affords the only poetic instance in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of Johnson's declamatory private reaction to a public situation" (44-5); "in short, he was transigent on the subject" (105); "the second and more important refraction of Johnson's days with the *Gentleman's Magazine* is that the *Memoirs* constitutes a journalistic biography" (108); "The *Life of Cheynel* has an analogical [analogous] function" (114).

Frankly, I do not see how the book can be regarded as a serious contribution to Johnson studies.

Brandeis University

D. J. GREENE

Paul Landis and Ronald E. Freeman, eds., *Letters of the Brownings to George Barrett* (Urbana, Ill.: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1958. viii + 392 pp. \$6.50). LITTLE privacy remains to the Brownings. Competent scholars have drawn a fine-meshed dragnet through the pertinent years and have landed an immense haul of facts. Indeed, it would not be difficult now (though laborious) to assemble a calendar to indicate where these poets were at any given moment and what they were doing or probably were doing. This intense scrutiny has in general benefited Mrs. Browning and hurt Browning.

The present letters to George Barrett illustrate, once more, why this is so. Mrs. Browning's letters, both before and after her marriage, are vibrant, particularly when she is defending Napoleon III or explaining the intricacies of Italian politics. She vibrates over spiritualism, too, but here she assembles zeros, all because she refused to ask any sensible questions, such as, why would spirits indulge in the childish pranks of lifting tables and perpetrating every sort of foolishness? One should sympathize with a husband who fairly cheerfully put up with a whole babble of absurdities, perhaps climaxed by this solemn assertion: "No doctrine should be received from spirits, who are always fallible, but only from the Word—We should all be clear upon this—" (p. 214.) What kind of other-world did Mrs. Browning have in mind?

If one wishes to shake Mrs. Browning for her prattle about mediums, he may be even more disposed to do so when she reports some of Pen's sayings. Did ever an English child say: "I affraid lose cold mountains and all y snow will mate Mama not velly well"? (p. 187.)

Nevertheless, except for spiritualism and Pen, Mrs. Browning shows up well as a mentally energetic, surprisingly good-humored, reasonably entertaining letter-writer. But what of her husband? At one place Browning says of his relationship with Mrs. Browning: "We differ *toto coelo* (or rather, *inferno*) as to spirit-rapping, we quarrel sometimes about politics, and estimate peoples' characters with enormous difference, but, in the main, we *know* each other, I say." (p. 256.) One should note—the Miller school of derogation notwithstanding—that Browning was almost always right, his wife almost always wrong in every argument the two had. Browning's rightness is doubtless one of his unlovable characteristics. His letters are frustrations, the outside of the poet—

And whoso desires to penetrate
Deeper, must dive by the spirit-sense.

Browning does not say in his letters what his editors wish he had said. And that makes him unlovable, too.

Professor Landis, assisted by Professor Freeman, has done an excellent, perceptive, sensitive job of editing. The annotations are honest, accurate, and as full as they should be. As the Preface indicates, the effort required to identify obscure persons "is usually in inverse ratio to the importance of the information." Nevertheless, the editors have been remarkably successful in providing what a reader needs. When speculating is called for, it is provided, as it should be, since those immersed in an editorial job are in the most favorable position to guess helpfully and intelligently.

There are in this volume, eighty-eight letters, fifty-eight from Elizabeth and thirty from Robert. The first letter is dated in 1838 and the last in 1889, a span of fifty-one years. They fall into three groups: 1-38 precede the marriage and 39 reports the marriage, memorably; 40-61 precede Mrs. Browning's death and 62 reports the death, movingly; 63-88 take Browning to within seven weeks of his own death.

The Introduction contains penetrating estimates of the two poets as persons and letter-writers. The editors, in general, approve Mrs. Browning and are sorrowful about Robert Browning. Robert is blamed for many things. He is blamed for Pen's many failures: he set a plan for his son which was not agreeable to Pen's talents. The truth seems to be that this only son had no talents except, as his father recognized, "that of living like the richest and idlest young men of his acquaintance," and of being possessed of the "double evil—the utmost self-indulgence joined to the greatest contempt of work and its fruits." Letters 72 (June 17, 1870) and 73 (July 1, 1870) are the distraught expressions of a father who has done his best for a son who has done nothing. In the second of these letters, Browning is as bitter as he ever permitted himself to be: "I am the manger at which he [Pen] feeds, and nothing is more certain than that I could do him no greater good than by dying tonight and leaving him just enough to keep him from starving."

Browning is blamed, too, for his treatment of Alfred Austin. The editors "feel revulsion at Browning's gloating attack upon [Austin's] physical deformity" (p. 14). Austin was a small man but was he deformed? Browning does not say so; he simply equates Austin's smallness of body with his demonstrable smallness of mind as evinced by his unscrupulous spitefulness.

One does not condemn the editors for their interpretation which must rest on subjective feeling. The same facts are susceptible to a different and—so far as Browning is concerned—a more favorable view.

One does praise the editors for making a significant series of letters available, for an able, honest job of editing, and for great felicity of style in the Preface, the Introduction, and even in the after-notes to each of the letters. *Letters of the Brownings to George Barrett* is a notable and important contribution to the better understanding of two major persons.

University of Tennessee

K. L. KNICKERBOCKER

William Faulkner, *New Orleans Sketches*, intro. by Carvel Collins (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1958. 223 pp. \$4.50).

WHILE living in New Orleans for some months during 1925, William Faulkner contributed sixteen sketches to the Sunday supplement of the *Times-Picayune* and a set of brief character sketches to the *Double Dealer*, a literary magazine which also printed several of his poems. With the exception of one short story and one sketch which had appeared in the University of Mississippi student newspaper, these were Faulkner's first efforts in prose fiction to be published. In 1953 the editors of *Faulkner Studies* reprinted eleven of the *Times-Picayune* sketches in book form as *Mirrors of Chartres Street*, and revived two others in the Winter, 1954, issue of that journal; these latter two were also distributed separately in a limited edition. These same thirteen were next reprinted in 1955 by the Hokuseido Press of Tokyo as *New Orleans Sketches by William Faulkner*. And now, finally, Carvel Collins has once again collected these thirteen but has added both the three which had remained in the *Times-Picayune* files and the *Double Dealer* group of sketches.

This seems an unnecessarily complicated printing history for items of such minor interest (especially when one recalls that Faulkner's major works were out of print only a few years ago), and if this new volume's only merit was the recovery of the final four stories and sketches its value at the price would be debatable. But Professor Collins's edition can be recommended to Faulkner students on two counts. First, he has provided a more nearly accurate text than that of the earlier editions, which contained a number of misreadings and

editorial revisions. Second, and more importantly, he has written an introduction which gives the most detailed account yet of the young Faulkner of the New Orleans literary set—of the friend (and parodist) of Sherwood Anderson, and of the would-be poet and artist who was beginning to turn his creative energies to his first novel, *Soldiers' Pay*. In addition, Professor Collins searches these early sketches for germs of the later works and finds a few—notably the portrait of the idiot clutching a flower, in "The Kingdom of God"—which are striking foreshadowings. Essentially, however, these early Faulkner pieces are amateur, derivative and overblown; and their chief interest may well lie in raising the question as to how their author, only four years later, could produce *The Sound and the Fury*.

Columbia University

JOSEPH V. RIDGELY

Clifton Cherpach, *The Call of Blood in French Classical Tragedy* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1958. 136 pp. \$3.50).

EVERYONE who has read at all widely in French literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been struck by the extensive use in this literature of so-called *romanesque* devices, the most frequent of which is the *cri du sang*, sometimes more aptly referred to as "the voice of nature." The author of the study under review defines the *cri du sang* as "a kind of instinctive knowledge of consanguinity which informs literary characters who may never have seen each other that they are linked by ties of blood." In his initial and most important chapter he makes the first really serious effort to find an explanation for the origin, dissemination, and acceptance of this theme. Primary source material being anything but abundant, he is obliged at times to resort to conjectures to fill in some of the steps in his lines of development. In a few instances his reasoning is a little hard to follow. He seems to have taken short cuts. Perhaps this is the result of publishing his material in a more condensed form than the one in which he originally incorporated it.

The author readily eliminates Aristotle and Greek tragedy as sources for the use of the *cri du sang*. He finds the source rather in the Greek novel, especially in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus which was very popular in the seventeenth century in the translations of Amyot and Montlyard. This theme makes its appearance in French fiction and drama in the early years of that century. From then on the plots of a

very large number of plays, even down into the nineteenth century, were complicated or resolved by this device and the recognition to which it inevitably led. Often it was used to compensate for a lack of skill and imagination, but in the hands of accomplished dramatists it became a part of the psychological portrayal of certain characters. Perhaps the first to link this mysterious instinct to the psychology of characters is Pierre Corneille. Cherpach's chapter on Corneille is recommended to the serious attention of students of that playwright. One wonders if the example in the use of the *romanesque* which Corneille set for dramatists that followed him is not even more important than indicated here. The remainder of this study consists of an analysis of selected examples of the use of the *cri du sang* in tragedy through the eighteenth century.

Those who are familiar with French literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries must have asked themselves more than once why the *romanesque* enjoyed such a vogue in an age supposedly dominated by reason. Cherpach believes that it was because it offered pleasure and entertainment, a kind of means of escape, and thus provided part of what he calls "the balanced tension" of this period. He also makes the interesting point that for various reasons the major part of the public must have accepted the *cri du sang* unquestioningly as a real phenomenon.

One could wish that it had been possible to find more adequate explanations for some of the aspects of the *cri du sang*. Despite the obstacles offered by a paucity of source material this study has cast much light on this phenomenon from many angles and offers certain thought-provoking observations. The author merits great credit for undertaking the investigation of a subject that has long demanded examination.

University of California, Berkeley

C. D. BRENNER

P. J. Norrish, *Drama of the Group. A Study of Unanimism in the Plays of Jules Romain* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1958. xi + 171 pp. \$4.75). WHEN *L'Armée dans la ville* was first performed Jules Romain had already given literary expression to his particular theory and ideal of collective life. The author of this study feels that the reader can benefit from an analysis of Romain's plays only if he has an understanding of the basic concept involved. He,

therefore, devotes the first chapter of an introduction that occupies about one third of his book to an examination of unanimism in the early period. Given the assumption above, this is logical, and it may indeed be welcome to the beginner student, for it is a faithful resumé of Romain's ideas, especially of those contained in *La Vie unanime* and in *Le Manuel de déification*. The exposition is clear, but it contributes nothing new. Its value would seem to be rather questionable for someone already acquainted with both works. More troublesome is the second chapter of the introduction. Here the purpose is to deal with the precursors of unanimism. This, as the author himself recognizes, is such a vast subject that it should really be covered in a separate study. How much, then, is gained from a listing of names, Durkheim, Verhaeren, Hugo, Zola, etc., and from a few lines of commentary on their works? This chapter is too long for what it accomplishes and not long enough for the serious aim it has in mind. In addition the author is worried by the fear of slighting Romain's "uniqueness." In the preface already the reader was warned about Romain's reluctance to admit direct influences on his work. To suggest sources could be interpreted, therefore, as questioning the playwright's good faith, and this would obviously not be proper. One can only admire and share this distaste for personal polemics, but to call attention to the existence of other theories and literary expressions of unanimism (which is what this chapter does anyway), is not to accuse Romain of a deliberate falsehood. It is not running "a risk which no publisher could afford to take." If the fear of personal involvement is so great, why insert these "controversial" considerations at all? Furthermore, such protestations of fairness—and they occur rather frequently—are unnecessary in a study so obviously dispassionate as this one is.

The actual core of the book is well organized. It is divided into two basic parts: "The Theory Dramatized" and "The Ideal Dramatized." Each individual chapter analyzes the various nuances that can be discovered in unanimism as a theory and unanimism as an ideal way of life. *L'Armée dans la ville* is the prototype of the plays that illustrate the existence of collective phenomena. *Cromedeyre-le-Vieil*, on the other hand, introduces the series that eulogize "la vie unanime" as a new and superior form of social ideal. It is true that most of the plays cannot be said to deal exclusively with either the theory or the ideal; they do, however, accent one side more than the other. For this reason, and it is a very convenient arrangement, they are not studied in their chronological order. While *L'Armée dans la ville* is

supposed to represent "pure" unanimism, the *Le Trouhadec* cycle and *Knock* embody "applied" unanimism, that is a unanimism concerned with "the problems of the day." The themes of bluff, the gullibility of the masses, the diffusion of ideas, are traced and developed to show that, as we witness a shifting from a type of mystical unanimism to a more realistic one, Romaines is actually discussing, if not condoning (and condemning?), existing or budding orders of society. Here the author takes great pains not to make Romaines an advocate of this or that form of contemporary totalitarian manifestations. This is especially true in the part dealing with unanimism as an ideal. Since Romaines comes to grips with such problems as nationalism and internationalism, the position of the individual in an all-powerful state, private and collective life, the question as to his own persuasion is inevitably raised. No positive answer is given, there are too many changes and shades of meaning to be observed in *Cromedeyre-le-Vieil*, *Le Dictateur*, *Jean le Maufranc* and *Musse*. One dogmatic statement cannot be applied to all. Frequent references to Romaines's political speeches, essays and his other works attempt to shed light on this point but do not dispel all confusion. The best solution is suggested in the last play *Grâce encore pour la terre!* where a distinction between "good" and "bad" unanimism is introduced. False ideas can indeed enslave entire nations. It is equally possible, however, that noble and peaceful ideals can liberate mankind and bring it together in fraternal associations. A deliberate spreading of "sweetness and love" throughout the world could show modern man a way out of his dilemma. Here the case rests.

This study is concerned with an objective assessment of Romaines's beliefs as expressed in his theater. The reader at large will no doubt welcome this primer. No prior acquaintance with the concept of unanimism is required to follow the examination of all the plays. Constant repetitions of basic notions presented in the introduction appear throughout the various chapters. Overly-generous quotations in French, however, do not always make for a smooth reading.

The Johns Hopkins University

WOLFGANG E. THORMANN

Diana Ramírez de Arellano, *Caminos de la creación poética en Pedro Salinas* (Madrid: Biblioteca Aristarco, 1956. 212 pp. \$3.90). SE trata de un libro que la crítica filológica manejará con provecho y que por todo admirador de Pedro Salinas será hojeado con placer y emoción. Se publican en él autógrafos de versiones no publicadas de poesías que después formarán parte de "La Voz a ti debida." Estas reproducciones—generalmente de difícil lectura—van acompañadas de transcripciones y pequeños estudios en que la autora comenta los cambios que las poesías han sufrido antes de imprimirse. En estos comentarios reside el mérito principal del libro, aunque las demás partes tampoco carezcan de interés. Es y quiere ser, sobre todo,—como dice el Prólogo y se nota en cada frase del Epílogo—un testimonio de "afecto y admiración"; pero, cabe añadir, de un afecto y una admiración espontáneamente comprensivos de la poesía salinesca. Es muy justo cuando la Sra. Ramírez nos dice que "una de las primeras cosas que saltan a la vista en "La voz a ti debida," es el esfuerzo del poeta por ir descarnando de realidad los seres y las cosas" (p. 17), y agrega bellamente después: "Son los sustantivos la carne de la lengua, y Salinas busca el hueso, el pronombre" (p. 19). El párrafo que enumera algunas citas de "Las primeras críticas de 'La voz a ti debida'" es de innegable utilidad para quien quiere hacerse una idea del ambiente intelectual en que el gran poema amoroso de Pedro Salinas se escribió. Es interesante estudiar las categorías con que en los años inmediatamente anteriores a la guerra civil española se hacía y se juzgaba poesía. Tradición y vanguardia, difícil, oscuro y claro, humano e intelectual, eran todavía palabras claves.

Cuando—pensando sobre todo en su parte principal—digo que el libro es de provechosa lectura para el filólogo, no es que crea que el estudio de los autógrafos aquí presentados puedan sacarse resultados que revolucionen el conocimiento y los juicios anteriormente enunciados sobre "La voz a ti debida." Pero, sí, podrán ahora ser mejor probados. Estudiando el nuevo material es ya imposible no ver que Leo Spitzer erró cuando pretendía que la realidad de la mujer, del tú de la poesía, "no se asienta más que en la especulación metafísica del poeta mismo" (*RHM*, VII, 1941, p. 37). La verdad es que la (relativa) inmaterialidad de esta poesía no está en el origen, sino que es el resultado de un consciente esfuerzo. Se ve claramente cuando se comparan, por ejemplo, las formas primitivas y definitivas de las siguientes poesías: "Y súbito, de pronto . . ." (*Poesías completas*. Madrid, 1955, p. 138 y sig. y Diana Ramírez, p. 37)," "Tú no puedes

quererme . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 184 y sig. y D. R., p. 114) y "Para vivir no quiero . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 146 y D. R., p. 39).

Pero frente a estas poesías depuradas de alusiones concretas hay otras a las que el poeta añade versos que, precisamente, destruyen la impresión de pureza "conceptista"—como diría Spitzer—que en su forma originaria en cierta medida poseían. Señalo como ejemplo "¡Qué cruce en tu muñeca . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 163 y D. R., p. 55, véase el comentario p. 54).

En la mayoría de los casos es evidente que Salinas cambia el texto, fruto de su primera inspiración, para lograr la expresión intelectual-mente más clara de la idea originaria, que muchas veces toma luego forma de frase tajante que—a modo de tema o conclusión—llega a definir el sentido de la composición poética entera. Véase: "No, no te quieren, no . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 168 y siguientes, D. R., p. 69); "Lo que eres, me distrae de lo que dices . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 169 y siguientes, D. R., p. 74); "Los cielos son iguales . . ." donde se introduce el verso cinco (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 170, D. R., p. 81; también *Poe. Compl.*, p. 188, D. R., p. 126, y en otros lugares). A veces se logra la aclaración, como la autora demuestra en los comentarios a "Lo que eres . . ." p. 72 (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 169) y "Con querer tú te basta" p. 66 (*Poe. Compl.*, "No, note quieren . . ." p. 168) por medio de explicaciones. En otras ocasiones las imágenes a metáforas no del todo transparentes se suprimen—por ejemplo en "Entre tu verdad más honda . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 188, D. R., p. 126—o se substituyen palabras o frases por otras más claras.—(Compárense: "Afán para no separarme . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 156, D. R., p. 46) o "Me debía bastar . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 171 y sig., D. R., p. 101).—Se añaden ideas o pensamientos nuevos, sugeridos por el contexto de la versión primera, observaciones todas que permiten generalizar más de lo que la Sra. Ramírez se atreve cuando una vez dice que "el poeta parece haber compuesto por ideas . . ." (p. 53). Sin embargo este "componer por ideas" no equivale desde luego en absoluto a aquel "frío intelectualismo" con que el Sr. Torrente Ballester, en su problemático *Panorama de la literatura española contemporánea*, atilda a tantos poetas del siglo XX.

Para el estudio de la versificación salinesca se encuentra aquí un rico material y habría merecido la pena insistir en la distribución de estrofas que casi siempre son más bien unidades de sentido que musicales.

Es una lástima que este trabajo de indudable mérito contenga una serie de faltas, ligerezas y juicios gratuitos. En la página 26 se dice

que el poeta intercaló dos versos en la versión definitiva de la poesía "Sí, detrás de las gentes . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 134), cuando en realidad se trata sólo de uno. Para que la frase "Al principio del poema ("Afán para no separarme . . ." (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 156) escribe para no separarme de ti, pero publica para no distraerme de ti" fuera cierta, habría que darle exactamente la vuelta, pues es al contrario.

Cuando se transcribe un manuscrito hay que transcribir también los errores. Salinas pone (p. 152) "Te ido quitando los labios." El "he" que aquí falta debería ir entre paréntesis. El cuadro de la página 137, tan complicado, que ilustra la evolución de la poesía "Me estoy labrando tu sombra" (*Poe. Compl.*, p. 190), no se aprovecha apenas. Me parece terminológicamente poco afortunado decir de una poesía de un poeta muerto que contiene "prosaísmos y debilidades imperdonables" (p. 49).—Los versos que motivan el comentario: "Salinas, a veces, juega a escondernos las cosas para que tengamos ese placer especial de encontrarlas" (p. 89), no admiten tal interpretación.—En la p. 119 el entusiasmo arrastra a la sensible autora a efusiones fuera de lugar: la añadidura de una simple "y" no justifica el título de "defensor del lenguaje."

Por último quiero señalar un inconveniente en la presentación del trabajo. Hubiera sido muy práctico imprimir las diversas versiones de las poesías analizadas—incluyendo, naturalmente, la definitiva—en hojas extensibles; pero si esto se ha suprimido para no aumentar el precio del libro, habría sido totalmente necesario señalar, al menos, las páginas en que en el tomo de *Poesías Completas* se encuentran los textos, necesario porque la autora no puede esperar que se acepten de buena fe sus comentarios, sin tener ante los ojos todo el material de que trata. Cómo las interpretaciones no son siempre acertadas puede verse en la p. 131.

Pero como ya hemos dicho al principio, a pesar de todos estos defectos, el libro es interesante y constituye un verdadero enriquecimiento de la bibliografía—cada día más amplia—sobre Pedro Salinas.

University of Cologne

HORST BAADER

María Soledad Carrasco Urgoiti, *El Moro de Granada en la literatura (del siglo XV al XX)* (Madrid: Revista de Occidente, 1956. 499 pp.). THIS careful and extensive study is an elaboration of the author's doctoral dissertation (Columbia, 1954) entitled: *The Moor of Granada*

in Spanish Literature of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. It is a good survey of a theme throughout Spanish literature and of its repercussions abroad. Such a study obviously demands the familiarity which this author possesses with several literatures, and the investigation involved is of really great scope. Miss Carrasco is to be congratulated on having brought it to a successful conclusion. It had not been systematically attempted before.

Even if the author had merely gathered together the results of previous and scattered studies of aspects of her theme, the work would be useful; but she has not only properly summarized and coordinated those prior investigations, she has also added a large amount of material of her own. Her prose style is straightforward but not dry, and gracefully enhances her work.

The theme of the Granadine Moor is studied chronologically in twelve chapters, from the fifteenth through the twentieth century. The whole of Chapter X (pp. 345-388) is, properly enough, devoted to Zorrilla.

With regard to the sixteenth and seventeenth century, Miss Carrasco says in an *Advertencia* that she has tended, advisedly, "principalmente a coordinar y sintetizar estudios previos." Naturally the Frontier and Moresque ballads, *El Abencerraje* and Pérez de Hita are the chief basis for investigating later developments of the theme. One very important point is well stressed: "El prototipo del moro galante, espejo de caballeros y enamorados, sólo adquirió sus rasgos precisos al entrar en contacto con el perfecto amador de las novelas caballerescas, influencia por otro lado de muy fácil asimilación, pues armonizaba con el clima moral implícito en la poesía fronteriza" (p. 49). One remembers in that connection the dissertation presented a generation ago by Harry Deferrari, *The Sentimental Moor in Spanish Literature before 1600* (Philadelphia, 1927) and the review of it by Barbara Matulka (*RR* XIX, 1928, p. 158), both of which are duly acknowledged in this present study.

Miss Carrasco does not attempt to settle the uneasy problems which still exist in connection with *El Abencerraje*. She surveys the scholarship on the question, even mentioning the version of the tale listed by Gallardo and by Gayangos as of Toledo, Miguel Ferrer, 1561 or 1562. No one seems to have seen it since, and this reviewer is among those who have vainly sought to rediscover it in Spain. Miss Carrasco is, of course, more concerned with the contents and the influence of this delightful little work, which she well traces in Spain and else-

where. She does equally well with the most important work of all for her theme, Pérez de Hita's so-called *Guerras civiles*. Both were obviously at the heart of the *comedia de moros y cristianos*. Hita's refined gallantries would naturally appeal to the literary fops imbued with the spirit of the Hôtel de Rambouillet. In fact one not very well known work, by Mme. de Villedieu, published in 1673, was actually called *Galanteries grenadines*. The first of the Hispano-Moresque novels, Georges (rather than Madeleine) de Scudéry's *Almahide* (1660) and the numerous other interminable novels of the school have been extensively studied already.

Almahide entered most importantly into the composition of the first significant English derivative of the Moresque theme, Dryden's *The Conquest of Granada by the Spaniards*. The first part was played in December of 1670, and the second part, also in five acts, early in 1671. Miss Carrasco does not mention the title by which it is also known, *Almanzor and Almahide*.

Miss Carrasco does well to stress the importance of Florian's *Gonzalve de Cordoue* as a very important link in the chain connecting earlier Moresque material with Romanticism. Florian's novel was translated into Spanish in 1794, and went through numerous editions. It is, naturally enough, the Romantic Period in various nations to which Miss Carrasco devotes the bulk of her study. Due attention is paid to Washington Irving. No one can object if Miss Carrasco devotes 44 pages to Zorrilla, the little poet who: "Nacido en el riñón de Castilla, gustaba llamarse cantor de Granada y árabe granadino" (p. 345). She well characterizes the overfluent poet's style as showing "—brío, garbo, donaire, gracia, y que también es característico de un cierto tipo de medianía española cuando cae en lo ramplón y cursi." Other Romantic authors are also studied, and Miss Carrasco seems to have made a good investigation of numerous minor productions long since forgotten. How many have much familiarity with, for example, Calixto Fernández Camporredondo or José González de Tejada? They were among the post-Romantic cultivators of the *romance morisco*.

It is well known that the Modernistas resolutely turned their poetic backs on the legendary Granada sung *ad nauseam* by Zorrilla. The old poet lived for five years after the appearance of Darío's *Azul*, but his inspirational force had long been spent. Darío was apologetic about feeling romantic emotions in Granada, and Unamuno swore never to express the deep impression that the City of the Alhambra

made on him. Later Andalusian poets such as Manuel Paso, Manuel Reina and Salvador Rueda displayed different attitudes and a much more sophisticated style than Zorrilla (p. 445). Villaespesa devoted several volumes of verse and two dramas to a Granada that was half Irving-Zorrilla and half Modernista. The generation of about 1925 and the post-war poets did not return to Granadine themes. García Lorca's Granada, for example, has nothing to do with romantic attitudes. Can there perhaps be something symbolic about Lorca's murder near that city by Franco sympathizers?

Miss Carrasco's full study must have been in press at the time of the appearance of a much more limited brief study by Daniel Bodmer, entitled *Die granadinischen Romanzen in der europäischen Literatur* (Zürich, 1955, 116 pp.), which is confined to the ballads on the siege of Granada and the doings of the Moors within its walls. Mr. Bodmer calls attention to the work of Diez, Grimm and Depping, and mentions the productions of Beauregard Pandin and Geibel. Miss Carrasco does not, but her study of the influence of Pérez de Hita and others is far more thorough, even for Germany. Neither author mentions Wm. J. Entwistle's *European Balladry* (Oxford, 1939), which devotes pp. 152-194 to Spanish Balladry. Neither mentions S. G. Morley's very useful *Spanish Ballads* (New York, 1911) and his articles on the subject.

The Bibliography (pp. 453-476) lists authors alphabetically but with first names first, as do the footnotes. The "Indice de nombres," not quite complete, more happily lists last names first. There are a number of misprints in addition to those listed in the "Fe de erratas" (p. 449).

The University of North Carolina

NICHOLSON B. ADAMS

Fritz Meyen, Johann Joachim Eschenburg 1743-1820 (Braunschweig: Waisenhaus Verlag, 1957. 130 pp. 4 plates. Braunschweiger Werkstücke, 20). ALTHOUGH Eschenburg's name appears in almost every German literary history of any size, no satisfactory and complete bio-bibliography has yet been written or compiled. Thus, in the framework of Eschenburg's activities as Shakespeare translator, literary historian and critic, librarian and professor, Dr. Meyen, librarian at the Carolo-Wilhelmina, Technische Hochschule, Braunschweig, attempts to revive a figure of the eighteenth century who so little

deserved the lack of recognition which has been accorded him in the past.

In the foreword the author states that the purpose of his work is to provide us with a much needed bio-bibliography of Eschenburg as a basis for future research. In the fifty-five pages devoted to the retelling of Eschenburg's life in terms of his works, Dr. Meyen simply retells much that is already known about Eschenburg and adds some very interesting new facts. He has documented this material with an extensive compilation of Eschenburg's literary accomplishments. Appended to the discussion of Eschenburg's life is a bibliography which Dr. Meyen claims to be as complete as possible.

Upon first reading this study one might conclude that much new biographical material concerning Eschenburg has been brought to light. However, glaring omissions may be found. It would have been desirable, for example, to have made at least some mention of the very important Eschenburg translations of English scholarly works by Thomas Warton, Richard Hurd, Charles Burney, Joseph Priestley, and Edward Gibbon. The prominence of Eschenburg in the field of Anglo-German literary relations, which my forthcoming study on Eschenburg will discuss, is ignored in this work. On the other hand, too many pages (thirteen) are devoted to a retelling and re-evaluation of Eschenburg's translation of Shakespeare, a phase of his work which has been treated quite adequately by Hans Schader in his dissertation, *Eschenburg und Shakespeare* (Marburg, 1911).

Although mention is made of Eschenburg's associates in Braunschweig, only a passing reference is made to the close friendship between Lessing and Eschenburg. There is, moreover, no discussion of the former's influence on the latter's literary endeavors. As evidence of this friendship there is a sizeable edited collection of Lessing's letters to Eschenburg, but there are no published or unpublished letters from Eschenburg to Lessing. Where are these letters? We wish Dr. Meyen had shed some light on this question.

In addition to the numerous translations from the English, Eschenburg, early in life, translated and made adaptations of popular French and Italian operas. This is another of his literary activities which has been slighted in this study.

Following the presentation of Eschenburg's life and works is a rather lengthy bibliography (49 pages—425 items) which is divided into three sections: (1) reference works used, (2) publications of Eschenburg, (3) publications about Eschenburg. In Section 2 the entries are arranged chronologically which is very good, but, at the

same time, this section is enlarged to greater proportions than is necessary. A poem, for example, is listed as a new bibliographical entry if it appeared in different periodicals in different publication years. In the case of Eschenburg's translation of Shakespeare, too, each volume is listed as a separate item. In this manner, this section is increased by 10%. Omitted from this section are a number of unpublished manuscripts, an indication that Dr. Meyen failed to consult Frels, *Deutsche Dichterhandschriften von 1400 bis 1900*, 1934, an inexcusable error when dealing with a subject of this nature.

Actually, the bibliography, the most important feature of this treatise, is incomplete; Eschenburg, a *Mitarbeiter* (1767-1806) on the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* and the *Neue Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*, wrote 1038 reviews, which are not included in Section 2 of the bibliography. G. F. C. Parthey, *Die Mitarbeiter an Friedrich Nicolai's Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*, 1842, is the key to the identification of the *Recensionen* Eschenburg wrote.

In addition, the many reviews of Eschenburg's work appearing in various periodicals are not included in Section 3. An excellent list of these reviews may be found in K. H. Jördens, *Lexikon deutscher Dichter und Prosaisten*, 1811, VI, 768-798 and in *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, ed. by J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, 1843, XXXVIII, 52-54.

No bibliography of published and unpublished letters is included. The only indication made of the voluminous unpublished Eschenburg correspondence at the Herzog-August Bibliothek at Wolfenbüttel is a slight reference on p. 34. In this respect, Frels, even though incomplete as far as Eschenburg's correspondence is concerned, should have been employed as a basis.

As is obvious, this is not a definitive work on Eschenburg; although it has a series of omissions, it is at least somewhat of a basis for future research on Eschenburg.

The Johns Hopkins University

MORGAN H. PRITCHETT

C. F. W. Behl and Felix A. Voigt, *Chronik von Gerhart Hauptmanns Leben und Schaffen* (München: Bergstadt Verlag, 1957, 139 pp.). "NOVEMBER, 6. [1912]: Max Liebermann über Gerhart Hauptmann an Alfred Lichtwark: 'Einen schöneren Kopf gibt's kaum . . . er ist der deutsche Dichter, auch weil er so aussieht.'" This

remark by the great painter, one of more than a thousand dated entries, is substantiated by the sixteen fine plates—paintings, etchings, sketches, sculptures and the death mask of Gerhart Hauptmann—that accompany the volume. It is also one of innumerable samples showing that a skeleton biography can be readable quite apart from its immense usefulness for reference purposes.

The present volume, long awaited, represents a completely recast and expanded version of the chronological data of Gerhart Hauptmann's life and work first published on the occasion of his eightieth birthday. Long and intimate personal association with the poet, expert familiarity with his published output, and unrestricted access to the vast literary archive of unpublished and fragmentary work are among the qualifications of the two distinguished collaborators in this venture, who are known to every Hauptmann scholar.

In reading the entries of this life and the background against which it unfolded, one becomes peculiarly aware of one central fact: Gerhart Hauptmann epitomized his epoch more than did any other German literary figure of his time. He was a boy of eight when the Franco-Prussian war and the founding of the German Empire made its impact on his imagination. He outlived the collapse of the *Reich* by one year. His formative years coincided with a period of unprecedented industrial expansion and social change. His own sudden rise to fame and fortune, after the "break-through" of his late twenties, reflects not only the enormous vitality of his creative genius but also the power of organized publicity and the climate of public opinion. From the time of his first success in 1889 until Hitler's accession to power he was always in the limelight. To the Prussian feudal class he was for decades a symbol of subversion. For two years the Berlin chief of police banned public performances of *Die Weber*. Kaiser Wilhelm twice vetoed the award of the Schiller prize to Hauptmann while Vienna needled official Berlin by repeatedly honoring him with the Grillparzer prize. In 1913, when Hauptmann had been commissioned to write the *Festspiel in deutschen Reimen* to commemorate the centenary of the Wars of Liberation in Breslau, the Prussian Crown Prince intervened to force its withdrawal after the fifth performance because it ended on an antimilitaristic note. After World War One everything was different: Gerhart Hauptmann automatically found himself the literary representative of the Weimar Republic. He was constantly in demand at official functions; he spoke on countless occasions; he was showered with orders, medals, diplomas, civic honors

and gifts from all quarters. There are years when the record of his life reads like an endless triumphal procession from city to city with performances, banquets, speeches on a scale so vast and so prolonged as to arouse a sense of concern and misgiving in the reader. All this came to an end in 1933: Hauptmann suddenly found himself relegated to the background, a symbol—still towering—of an age swept away. He read the signs of the times correctly when he said to Behl: "Meine Epoche beginnt mit 1870 und endigt mit dem Reichstagsbrand."

Seen in the perspective of later events, Gerhart Hauptmann's way of identifying himself with the spirit of the German people, evokes a sense of incredulous awe. There was something bordering on the mythical in his own self-appraisal. Though he never lost sight of his humble origins, he came to accept himself unquestioningly as the chosen vessel ordained alike to give voice to the yearnings of the inarticulate masses and to carry on the lofty tradition of Goethe's poetic wisdom. With a simplicity that had outgrown sophistication he treasured a bowlful of earth from Weimar, he cut a reed from the banks of the Avon, he furtively broke an olive twig at Olympia, and he transferred to his native Silesian soil a sprig of the ivy that George Washington had planted at Mount Vernon. Against the background of an attitude so affirmatively disposed to the simple visible token as a symbol of the invisible, we can understand the arrangements he ordered for his own funeral: Garbed in a Franciscan cassock, his hands folded over the worn New Testament that had been the adolescent's companion, his head pillowed on a copy of *Der Große Traum*, Gerhart Hauptmann was laid to his last rest.

Yale University

HERMANN WEIGAND

Georg Brandes, *Correspondance, Vol. II: L'Angleterre et la Russie; Vol. IV, 2: Notes et Références* [for Vol. II], ed. Paul Krüger (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1956. Vol. II: xxxix + VIII [Plates] + 249 pp.; Vol. IV, 2: pp. 193-291. Publiée par la Société pour l'Étude de la Langue et de la Littérature Danoises aux frais de la Fondation Rask-Ørsted). INCLUDING, as Vol. II does, mainly two of Brandes correspondents—English Edmund Gosse and Russian Pierre Kropotkin—more of a feeling of continuity arises than in Vol. I with its 18 personalities. But each volume is invaluable:

Vol. I for the literary and political views expressed e. g., by Taine, Clemenceau, Rolland, Anatole France. In Vol. I we have vivid snapshots; in II full-length portraits.

Vol. II begins with two letters from John Stuart Mill: one, 1870 concerning *Subjection of Women*; the other 1872, on the International. To Mill the one important and good side of the labor movement was the fact that it would make the propertied classes sit up and think. In the Brandes-Kropotkin correspondence this same question becomes all-overshadowing. The issue of women's rights, it seems, loomed larger in Brandes' mind just before 1870 than at any later stage. Women meant—and continued to mean a great deal in his life—from his mother on. And in various ways. Amours belonged. Conversation with beautiful brilliant women inspired him. With typical enthusiasm Brandes finished a translation of Mill's *Subjection* into Danish the same year that the original was published (1869). He thus introduced feminism into Scandinavia (at the cost of several friendships) and influenced Ibsen, Björnson, Kjelland, and Strindberg,—positively and negatively.

The correspondence between Gosse and Brandes shows touching, genuine friendship between two literary critics, two diametrically opposed natures,—a friendship which lasted for almost 40 years from 1873 to 1912, although the two men actually saw each other only a few times. Brandes had then already begun his character sketches and his series of free-lance lectures on main currents in the nineteenth century. In these he planned to psychoanalyze the literature of the period 1800-1848 in France, Germany, and England, and to demonstrate the rhythm in the waves: reaction followed by evermounting waves of progressive thinking. With these lectures Brandes aimed to let in fresh air from the outside into the stagnant conditions in Denmark, due mainly, he believed to the stranglehold of Church exercised over State and University (cf. # 327, note 1). Brandes became a storm center, as fiercely hated and feared by conservatives for his "godlessness," his "rootedness in filth," as he was admired by the progressives for his courage, his trenchant style, his ability to recognize genius. The letters to his English friend abound in wholesale arrogant invectives against the Danish people and jeremiads over his own isolation. Withal he loved Denmark and Danish fervently. That conditions in Denmark were actually not so oppressive as they appeared to the rebel, various details show. From the beginning of the correspondence between Gosse and Brandes each wrote in his own language, a

practical *modus vivendi* also resorted to in their meeting in Copenhagen after Brandes in his fiery eagerness was about to tear his hair over Gosse's laborious Danish. He himself, though fluent in French and German, was poor in spoken English. However, the two evidently became "du's" at this time,—a privilege granted sparingly by the Danish critic in mature years.

Genuine unselfish friendship brought reciprocal benefit to the two prolific writers. Each constituted an information bureau for the other. Horizons widened. Thus Swinburne was introduced to Brandes early in the correspondence as "without question our greatest living poet . . . he is often turbid, violent, obscure. But he has magnificent powers . . ." (# 305). Gosse wrestled with the insurgent Brandes' stubborn admiration for Byron as against Shelley: ". . . As a lyrist, Shelley excelled Byron as much as a violin excels a French horn. . . ." Brandes, on the other hand, acquainted Gosse with the exquisite prose of J. P. Jacobsen, then just beginning to be known by a handful in Denmark, and he often explained to Gosse the Norwegian Ibsen, whose *Brand*, *Per Gynt* and other early plays Brandes had championed in Denmark. Bjørnsen remained a bone of contention in spite of Brandes' efforts. The case of Zola provided one of the most interesting jousts. In reply to Swinburne's and Gosse's attack Brandes wrote: "To me there is no vestige of a doubt that Zola is the greatest poetic talent that France possesses at the moment . . ." (# 334 and note).

The late letters show Gosse mellow, affluent,—and static; Brandes still the proud, lonely, anything but rich rebel, at 63 still dynamic and flexible, as we see in his response to a flattering offer from Gosse to write on Scandinavian literature for the English public. Letters in the first volume of the correspondence reveal the 83-year old intellectual grappling with the new scientific theories of Bohr (# 273) and Einstein (# 281)—and enjoying them: "Plus j'étudie Einstein, plus je suis surpris de son génie." Gosse lived in an ivory tower. Social problems lay outside his domain. Politics was repugnant, a field from which he urged Brandes to keep aloof. His sympathies lay with Orthodoxy and Monarchy. Brandes' trail-blazing also in sociological thought, as well as in literature is clearly discernible in the Gosse-Brandes letters, his position at each turn defended with the same fiery batailleur spirit.

Brandes' sociological trail-blazing stood out later even more in the exchange of letters with Kropotkin. The trail, however, now shifted, moved decidedly upward. Nietzsche's influence (which merely strengthened an early strain in Brandes) revealed itself already in

the title of Brandes' Paris lecture, "le grand homme, origine et fin de la civilisation," 1902, expressive of Brandes' "aristocratic radicalism" (cf. *Corr. I*, # 112 and note 2). Kropotkin was shocked and grieved *Corr. II*, # 401, 402). The problem was discussed from various angles. The pattern of life was already set for these two when they met rather late (1896) in England. Brandes was of course famous as an iconoclastic literary critic; Kropotkin as the great humanitarian who had refused brilliant court life, renounced the career of a scientific explorer in order to dedicate himself to practical sociology,—to anarchism. The importance of the Brandes-Kropotkin correspondence lies in the strong spot-light it casts upon the titanic convulsions in Russia and in Poland (1896-1919). Most of the letters have remained unpublished until now. Exceptions are # 373, 374, 430. All are written in French. The very first letters sound the dominant note in Kropotkin's life. The cult of the people, we know from the *Memoirs of a Revolutionary* (1898-99), goes back to his childhood. From the letters one sees that Kropotkin for years regarded the peasants as the backbone of the coming revolution. The workers, too, were rising, however, and by 1905 he saw them definitely taking the lead.

Acts of political oppression everywhere are publicly denounced by the two correspondents, e. g., the treatment of the Armenians, of the Danish minority in North Schleswig, the Dreyfus case. England is regarded by Kropotkin with mixed feelings, with gratitude for the thirty-one years of asylum granted him, admiration for the British love of freedom and struggle for freedom, but also with caustic criticism because of the rampant chauvinism and mercenariness and the still more reprehensible egging-on and manoeuvring by British politicians and "coupon-cutters" in the case of the Russo-Japanese war and during the time of the Franco-German tension. All of Kropotkin's letters, except the very last one, were written outside Russia. The last, dated April 28, 1919 and written after his disagreement with the Bolsheviks, was smuggled across the border from a small village in Russia and gives an analysis of the situation there. It is Kropotkin's last known letter to Brandes and perhaps the most valuable in the collection.

Volume III of this series promises to provide illuminating material on other European conditions and events in letters between Brandes and Paul Heyse, Fr. Nietzsche, Rainer Maria Rilke and others.

Baltimore

CAROL K. BANG

n
l-
d
m
n
se
at
ne
al
n
ic
rs
4,
ne
w
is
d
s,
g

y
ne
is
ne
h
i-
ne
i-
r
's
t,
ne
n
's
ne

al
es

es

fin
cal-
and
rom
hen
urse
reat
the
ical
kin
anic
ters
374,
the
now
his
ded
ers,
ing

by
the
is
the
ish
iti-
the
bli-
var
n's
st,
he
in
n's
he

ial
les

Skills and Techniques for Reading French

BY LOUISE C. SEIBERT & LESTER CROCKER

A tested new method for
independently acquiring proficiency
in reading French, building
vocabulary, and extracting meaning
without word-for-word translation.

272 pages

\$4.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Baltimore 18, Maryland



Patrick Brontë, father of the sister novelists Emily and Charlotte Brontë, figured so prominently in the lives and writings of his daughters that he has been the subject of much attention in literary history. An early biography of Charlotte distorted her father's character beyond recognition. This sensational and inaccurate characterization became legendary as it grew and became more and more distorted. As a result, much of what has been written about the Brontë sisters has been based on the assumption that Patrick Brontë was an eccentric, tyrannical, possessive master who warped the minds of his

THE FATHER OF THE BRONTËS

ANNETTE B. HOPKINS

daughters. Miss Hopkins has shed new light on this misunderstood man and proves that the freedom he fostered in the Brontë home was extraordinary for the early 19th century. One result of this illuminating study will be reexamination of the Brontë sisters' works, not as the products of domestic oppression, but as works of art executed in unusual freedom.

Miss Hopkins is Professor Emeritus of English, Goucher College.

200 pages \$4.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND
